DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 902 24 JC 690 183

By-Kurth, Edwin L.; Mills, Eric R.
Analysis of Degree of Faculty Satisfactions in Florida Community Junior Colleges. Final Report.
Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-8-D-047
Pub Date Dec 68
Grant-OEG-4-8-080047-0049-057
Note-135p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$6.85
Descriptors-*Attitudes, *Faculty, *Junior Colleges, Questionnaires, Teacher Attitudes, *Teacher Characteristics
Identifiers-*Florida

Data were collected by a 220-item questionnaire on six aspects of the faculty member's own college and certain attributes of those most and least satisfied. Of 4289 questionnaires sent, 2756 replies were usable. Computer tabulations were made for full- and part-time faculty, full-time faculty by college, the satisfied, and the dissatisfied. Findings were (1) satisfied teachers contribute more to the junior college objectives, especially community service; (2) there are a few complacent faculty members; (3) most faculty, while content with their profession, working conditions, community, associates, and students, wish to improve both the institution and themselves; (4) opinions differ on the role of counselors and teachers; (5) salary is less important than other teaching conditions; (6) there is too little in-service or other training; (7) teachers want more say in decision making; (8) degree and special training qualifications are lower than 1962; (9) no specific background mix assures the best teacher preparation. Recommendations were (1) increased in-service or graduate training; (2) more faculty participation in governance; (3) resources to alleviate certain faculty dissatisfactions; (4) a statewide study of guidance and counseling; (5) much more statewide institutional research; (6) further work on some findings of this study; (7) statewide study of student characteristics affecting the colleges; (8) study of subclassifications of and satisfied and dissatisfied; (9) repetition of this study in five years. (HH)

ED027902

BR 8D047
PA 24

FINAL REPORT

OE-BR

Project number 8-D-047

Grant number OEG-4-8-080047-0049-057

ANALYSIS OF DEGREE OF FACULTY SATISFACTIONS IN FLORIDA COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES

December, 1968

JC 690 183

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT

Project Number 8-D-047

Grant Number OEG-4-8-080047-0049-057

ANALYSIS OF DEGREE OF FACULTY SATISFACTIONS IN FLORIDA COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES

Edwin L. Kurth

Eric R. Mills

Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

December, 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 0 5 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to express their sincere appreciation to Dr. Lee G. Henderson, Assistant Superintendent in charge of Division of Community Junior Colleges, Florida State Department of Education, and the presidents of the twenty-six Florida community junior colleges for their support and assistance in collecting information for the study. To Dr. Douglas M. Montgomery, the authors wish to express special thanks for permission to use a modified version of his questionnaire and to quote extensively from his 1962 study of the Florida community junior college faculty.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ---------- ii

LIST OF TABLES ---------- v

SUMMARY ---------- 1

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION ---------- 9

Statement of the Problem ---------- 11
The Problem ---------- 11
Sub-Problems ---------- 11
Need for the Study ---------- 12
Delimitations ---------- 13
Related Research ---------- 13
Procedures ---------- 16
General Design ---------- 16
Population ---------- 16
The Instrument ---------- 16
Collection of the Data ---------- 17
Analysis of the Data ---------- 18

II. PROFILE OF THE FACULTY ---------- 20

The Faculty Member and His Family ---------- 20
Background Data on Parents ---------- 29
The Faculty Member--Youth through College ---------- 32
Previous Educational Experience ---------- 37
General Working Conditions ---------- 38
Attitude Toward Functions of the Community Junior College ---------- 43
Attitude Toward Guidance and Counseling ---------- 47
Degree of Satisfaction with Own Junior College ---------- 49
The "Typical" Faculty Member ---------- 55
Faculty Trends--1962 to 1968 ---------- 56

III. COMPARISON OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED FACULTY GROUPS ---------- 59

Personal Background ---------- 59
Educational Preparation ---------- 61
Present Status and Position ---------- 64

CHAPTER Page

III. (continued)

Satisfactions with Junior College Work ------------------ 66
Attitude on Importance of Community Junior College Functions -------------------------------- 70
Attitude on Counseling and Guidance --------------------- 74
Satisfactions with Own Junior College ------------------- 77
Summary -- 82

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions -- 85
Recommendations -- 86

APPENDICES

A. JUNIOR COLLEGES PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY -------------- 88

B. QUESTIONNAIRE INCLUDING PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES FROM FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS ---------------------- 91

REFERENCES -- 125

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME POSITIONS IN FLORIDA COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES -------------------- 21
2. AGE RANGE FOR FLORIDA COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY -- 22
3. MARITAL STATUS OF FACULTY MEMBERS ----------------------- 22
4. NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN FAMILIES ------------------------- 23
5. GRADE LEVEL COMPLETED BY SPOUSES ------------------------ 23
6. SALARY RANGE FOR FULL-TIME TEACHERS FOR TEN MONTHS NORMAL TEACHING LOAD ------------------------- 24
7. ANNUAL SALARY RANGE FOR NON-TEACHING FACULTY ------------ 26
8. PARTICIPATION IN CHURCH ACTIVITIES ---------------------- 27
9. PARTICIPATION IN CIVIC GROUPS --------------------------- 27
10. MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ---------------- 28
11. MEMBERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ----------------- 28
12. UTILIZATION OF TIME DURING SUMMER SESSIONS -------------- 29
13. FAMILY SATISFACTION WITH COMMUNITY ---------------------- 30
14. FATHERS' OCCUPATIONS ------------------------------------ 30
15. GRADE LEVEL COMPLETED BY FATHER AND MOTHER -------------- 32
16. COMMUNITIES IN WHICH FACULTY MEMBERS HAVE RESIDED -- 33
17. DESIGN OF TEACHING METHODS COURSES TAKEN BY FACULTY --- 36
18. YEARS TAUGHT IN JUNIOR COLLEGE -------------------------- 38
19. PRINCIPAL METHOD BY WHICH PRESENT POSITION WAS OBTAINED --------------------------------------- 39
20. SATISFACTION WITH TEACHING AND JUNIOR COLLEGE WORK AS A CAREER ----------------------------------- 39

Table Page

21. FACTORS HAVING MOST OVERALL BENEFIT TO JUNIOR COLLEGE WORK ---------------------------------- 42

22. ATTITUDE TOWARD FACULTY RANK ---------------------------- 42

23. ATTITUDE ON NAME PREFERRED FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES --- 43

24. PROGRAM EMPHASIS IN JUNIOR COLLEGE ---------------------- 44

25. DEGREE OF ACCEPTANCE OF SELECTED JUNIOR COLLEGE FUNCTIONS -- 45

26. FACULTY SATISFACTION WITH SELECTED FUNCTIONS AND FEATURES OF OWN JUNIOR COLLEGE -------------------- 50

27. PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED GROUPS ON QUESTIONS RELATING TO PERSONAL BACKGROUND --- 60

28. PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED GROUPS ON QUESTIONS RELATING TO EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION ------------------------------ 62

29. PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED GROUPS ON QUESTIONS RELATED TO PRESENT STATUS AND POSITION -------------------------- 65

30. PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED GROUP AND DISSATISFIED GROUP ON QUESTIONS RELATING TO SATISFACTION WITH JUNIOR COLLEGE WORK ---------------------------- 67

31. PERCENTAGES ON SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED GROUPS ON QUESTIONS RELATED TO IMPORTANCE OF JUNIOR COLLEGE FUNCTIONS -------------------------- 72

32. PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED GROUPS ON SELECTED QUESTIONS RELATED TO ATTITUDES ON GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING FUNCTIONS ----------------- 74

33. PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED GROUPS ON QUESTIONS RELATED TO SATISFACTIONS WITH OWN JUNIOR COLLEGE ---------------- 78

SUMMARY

Purpose and Procedures

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the degree of faculty satisfactions in Florida community junior colleges with respect to various features, activities, programs, policies, organization, and conditions in their own junior college; and to determine the characteristics, opinions, and attitudes of those most satisfied and most dissatisfied.

As a basis for acquiring information needed for making the study, a questionnaire (Appendix B) was developed. The questionnaire was a modified version of one developed by Montgomery (27, pp. 79-111) for use in his 1962 study. The instrument contained 220 items on faculty personal and educational background, attitudes on junior college work in general, attitudes on functions of the community junior college, attitudes on guidance and counseling, degree of satisfaction with own junior college, and related data.

The questionnaire was sent through college presidents to all part-time and full-time teachers, administrators, and counselors employed by Florida's twenty-six community colleges, which had been in operation more than one year. A total of 4,289 questionnaires was distributed, of which, 3,022 were completed and mailed direct to the Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, for processing. Of the 3,022 questionnaires returned, 2,641 from full-time faculty members and 248 from part-time faculty members were coded and tabulated, while 133 were determined to be not suitable for coding or were received too late for processing. Data from the questionnaires were coded on IBM data sheets, and results from each questionnaire were sense punched on four IBM cards by use of an IBM 1230 optical scanner.

The IBM 360 computer at the University of Florida Computing Center was used to process the data. Separate frequency distributions of responses to each question were tabulated for: (a) all full-time faculty members, (b) all part-time faculty members, (c) full-time faculty members by college, (d) the "satisfied" group, and (e) the "dissatisfied" group. The "satisfied" group consisted of 454 (about one-sixth) full-time faculty respondents who, by their responses to fifty-nine questions numbered 167-225 in the questionnaire, indicated the highest degree of satisfaction with a variety of features and conditions in their own junior colleges. The "dissatisfied" group consisted of 444 (about one-sixth) of the full-time faculty respondents who, by their answers to the same questions, indicated the highest degree of dissatisfaction. For purposes of separating the two groups weighted values were assigned to questions 167-225 in the questionnaire.

Summary of Findings

A summary at the end of Chapters II and III set forth the principal findings in each of these chapters. In this section, an effort is made to tie these findings to the specific questions enumerated in Chapter I as sub-problems.

1. What are the current specific backgrounds, experience, and quantifiable characteristics of faculty members in Florida's community junior colleges?

Sixty-eight per cent are male as compared to 66 per cent in 1962; 71.8 per cent are full-time teachers as compared to 68 per cent in 1962; average age is about 41, almost a year older than in 1962; ages are evenly distributed in the age brackets 25 to 54 years, with small increases in age brackets 25-29 and 50-54 since 1962; 48.4 per cent have served in the armed forces as compared to 54 per cent in 1962, but 9.5 per cent are retired military personnel as compared to 5 per cent in 1962; 74.6 per cent are married as compared to 72 per cent in 1962; the most frequent number of children per family was two in 1968 and 1962; 39.7 per cent of faculty spouses had earned bachelor's or higher degrees as compared to 36.2 per cent in 1962.

Median salary is about $9,250 as compared to about $5,830 in 1962; 69.9 per cent own or are buying their home as compared to 67 per cent in 1962; 52.7 per cent participate regularly or often in church activities as compared to 62 per cent in 1962; 55.1 per cent belong to no civic group as compared to 52 per cent in 1962; over 90 per cent reported belonging to one or more professional or scholarly organizations pertaining to their subject matter area as compared to 89 per cent in 1962; 80.8 per cent belong to educational organizations of a general nature as compared to 92 per cent in 1962; and 86.1 per cent of the faculty families are satisfied or very satisfied with the community in which they live as compared to 82 per cent in 1962.

About 17 per cent of faculty members' fathers and mothers lived most of their lives in Florida as compared to 15 per cent in 1962; faculty members' fathers engaged in a wide range of occupations, with little difference between 1962 and 1968 except a small drop in percentage of fathers who were unskilled or lower-salaried workers; 19.5 per cent of faculty members' fathers had earned bachelor's or higher degrees as compared to 19.4 per cent in 1962; and 12.7 per cent of the mothers had earned bachelor's or higher degrees in both 1968 and 1962.

Twenty-two per cent spent most of their youth in Florida as compared to 18 per cent in 1962, 43.9 per cent spent most of their adult years in Florida as compared to 36 per cent in 1962; 50.7 per cent lived most of their youth in communities of 10,000 or less as compared to 55 per cent in 1962; after college only 24.6 per cent lived most of their lives in communities of 10,000 or less as compared to 32.3 per cent in 1962; 56 per cent graduated from a large high school as compared to 60 per cent in 1962; 97.6 per cent hold a bachelor's degree, 90 per cent a master's degree and 9.2 per cent a doctor's degree, as compared to 100, 93, and 13 per cents, respectively, in 1962; 29.1 per cent earned their bachelor's degrees in Florida as compared to 24 per cent in 1962, 31.2 per cent earned their master's degrees in Florida as compared to 26 per cent in 1962, 3.9 per cent of the faculty had completed doctorates in Florida in 1962 and 1968; 18.6 per cent had attended junior college as compared to 16 per cent in 1962; and 34.5 per cent belonged to social fraternities or sororities as compared to 35 per cent in 1962.

Forty-five per cent had formal course(s) designed specifically to prepare for teaching in a junior college as compared to 63 per cent in 1962; 19.5 per cent had informal course(s) designed to assist in junior college teaching as compared to 31 per cent in 1962; 39 per cent had course(s) dealing primarily with junior college curriculum and purpose as compared to 56 per cent in 1962; 36.7 per cent had participated in in-service programs where considerable attention was given to junior college curriculum and purposes as compared to 62 per cent in 1962; and 11.9 per cent had teaching methods courses designed for teaching in a junior college as compared to 11 per cent in 1962.

Sixty-one per cent had taught in one or more elementary or secondary schools as compared to 70 per cent in 1962; 33.8 per cent had taught in one or more four-year colleges as compared to 44 per cent in 1962; 57 per cent had taught in a junior college three years or less as compared to 65 per cent in 1962; 51 per cent obtained their present positions by personal visit or letter as was the case in 1962; and 80 per cent have not attempted to locate another position as compared to 82 per cent in 1962.

2. What are the current attitudes and opinions of faculty members on various matters having to do with their personal and work situations?

Ninety-five per cent were satisfied or very satisfied with teaching as a career as compared to 96 per cent in 1962; 93.6 per cent were satisfied or very satisfied with junior college work as a career as compared to 90 per cent in 1962; 58.5 per cent definitely plan to stay in junior college work until retirement as compared to 55 per cent in 1962; main satisfactions with junior college work chosen in 1962 and 1968 were: enjoyment of teaching, helping young people grow, association with college age students, freedom and independence of work, fine colleagues, desirable environment, and intellectually stimulating associations; main dissatisfactions with junior college work chosen in 1962 and 1968 were: need to transmit elementary knowledge, poorly motivated students, excessive classroom hours, lack of time for class preparation, and administrative procedures; and, as to factors for most overall benefit to junior college work, 31 per cent said higher pay as compared to 52 per cent in 1962, 12.5 per cent said better facilities as compared to 9 per cent in 1962, and 17.9 per cent said lighter teaching load as compared to 8 per cent in 1962.

Sixty-four per cent work forty-five or more hours per week for their junior college as compared to 78 per cent in 1962; 49.7 per cent would teach in a junior college if they had their lives to live over again as compared to 49 per cent in 1962; 54.2 per cent prefer to teach in a junior college to any other level of teaching or profession as compared to 54 per cent in 1962; 49.5 per cent favor faculty rank as compared to 39 per cent in 1962; 19.6 per cent favored "Community Junior College" as part of the nomenclature of their college as compared to 13 per cent in 1962; and 34.2 per cent believe the college president has the most powerful voice in determining the educational program of the college as compared to 27 per cent in 1962.

3. To what extent do faculty members understand and accept stated purposes of the Florida community junior college?

Sixty per cent believe that equal emphasis should be placed on transfer, terminal, and community service functions as compared to 57 per cent in 1962; 21.2 per cent believe emphasis should be placed about equally on the transfer and terminal functions as compared to 18 per cent in 1962; and 8 per cent believe emphasis should be placed primarily on the transfer function as compared to 15 per cent in 1962.

Over 80 per cent accept, as important functions of the Florida community junior college, the transfer program, the terminal program, evening classes, general education courses, and guided or developmental studies; less than 50 per cent accept elderly citizens courses and high school completion courses as important functions; in general, functions associated with academic instruction were accepted by an equal or higher percentage of the faculty than in 1962; in general, student service related functions were accepted by a higher percentage of the faculty in 1962; 51.8 per cent accept an open admission policy to all courses; and 62 per cent accept a restricted admission policy to college transfer courses.

4. What are the attitudes and opinions of faculty members toward counseling and guidance functions in Florida community junior colleges?

Ninety per cent accept career selection counseling and 74.4 per cent accept counseling on personal problems as important functions of a Florida community junior college; 34 per cent think professional counselors should be used primarily for personal problems other than counseling, while 46.7 per cent think they should be used primarily for both academic and personal problems; 58 per cent disagree that junior colleges devote too much time to personal counseling; 82 per cent disagree that an "open door" policy eliminates necessity for testing of new students: 49 per cent agree and 41.7 per cent disagree that faculty members should participate extensively in student extracurricular activities; 55.8 per cent desire to participate some or very much in student extracurricular activities; 72.6 per cent believe junior colleges should encourage students to participate in clubs, while 66.1 per cent believe they should encourage student participation in recreational activities. Response patterns in 1962 were similar.

Fifty-eight per cent consider counseling of all types equally as important as academic instruction while 32.8 per cent consider it less important; 60.8 per cent consider academic advising equally as important as academic instruction while 30.4 per cent consider it less important; and 48.7 per cent consider counseling on personal problems equally as important as academic instruction while 40 per cent consider it less important. The response patterns in 1962 were similar.

5. What are the attitudes and opinions of faculty members on the organization, programs, policies, and operating procedures in the Florida community junior college?

Ninety-one per cent rate the quality of their faculty good or very good as compared to 88 per cent in 1962; 44.3 per cent consider quality of their students good or very good as compared to 22 per cent in 1962; 87.9 per cent rate quality of teaching as good or very good as compared to 84 per cent in 1962; 70.3 per cent consider administration in their junior college good or very good as compared to 77 per cent in 1962; 37.1 per cent rated student government as good or very good as compared to 43 per cent in 1962.

Fifty-nine per cent consider faculty morale throughout the school is good or very good as compared to 64 per cent in 1962; 70.3 per cent consider flow of information between the administration and faculty fairly adequate or entirely adequate as compared to 87 per cent in 1962; 59.5 per cent consider faculty influence and participation in selection of new faculty members is about right as compared to 75 per cent in 1962; 49.5 per cent think faculty participation and influence in design of new buildings is about right as compared to 63 per cent in 1962.

Seventy per cent are satisfied with admission policy as compared to 56 per cent in 1962; except for eating facilities, more of the faculty are satisfied with physical facilities than in 1962; except for student newspaper and regulations on student dress, more of the faculty are satisfied with student services than in 1962; 60.2 per cent are satisfied with their student-teacher ratio as compared to 77 per cent in 1962; 60.1 per cent are satisfied with number of students in classrooms as compared to 75 per cent in 1962; 85.7 per cent are satisfied with length of class period as compared to 90 per cent in 1962; 70.4 per cent are satisfied with present grading practices as compared to 77 per cent in 1962; 61.1 per cent are satisfied with their teaching load as compared to 65 per cent in 1962; and 64.8 per cent are satisfied with student contact hours as compared to 66 per cent in 1962.

In general, there is satisfaction with all library services; 46.8 per cent were satisfied with purchasing policies as compared to 40 per cent in 1962; 54.5 per cent were satisfied with personnel policies as compared to 49 per cent in 1962.

Fifty-six per cent are satisfied with provisions for professional and sabbatical leave; 58.5 per cent with faculty participation in curriculum development; 40.9 per cent with faculty in-service training programs; 52.7 per cent with college organization and administrative procedures; 51.9 per cent with time available for professional study and preparation; 41.9 per cent with faculty participation in policy-formulation and decision-making; 37.3 per cent with effectiveness of faculty meetings; and 59.6 per cent with orientation procedures for new faculty members.

6. In terms of total responses, how do current backgrounds, characteristics, attitudes, and opinions differ from those found in the survey conducted by Montgomery (27) in 1962?

In question 1 through 5 immediately preceding, direct comparisons are made in response patterns of the faculty in the 1968 and 1962 surveys. In many areas there were only small differences in faculty background, attitudes, and opinions in 1962 and 1968. Some of the differences noted in 1968 as compared to 1962 are: slight increase in male faculty members; salaries are appreciably higher; the faculty has less formal and informal training designed specifically for junior college teaching; in general, the faculty are more satisfied with library services, student services, and physical facilities; and, in general, the faculty are more dissatisfied with their teaching situation (student-teacher ratio, teaching load, etc.), administrative procedures and organization, and faculty participation in decision- and policy-making.

> 7. What are the areas of satisfactions and dissatisfactions of faculty members with various features and conditions in their own junior college, and what are the characteristics and opinion patterns of those satisfied and those dissatisfied?

The characteristics, opinion patterns, and degree of satisfaction of the faculty as a whole were summarized under questions 1 through 5. On many items in the questionnaire there was little difference between response patterns of the satisfied group, the dissatisfied group and the faculty as a whole. Some of the more significant differences are summarized below.

Members of the satisfied group, as compared to the dissatisfied group are:

a. Older, more of them are female, more are married, more served in the armed forces, more are retired from the armed forces, more spent their youth on a farm or in a town of 2,500 or less, fewer of them spent their adulthood in cities of 100,000 or more, more of them belong to civic groups and educational groups of a general nature, more of them participate regularly in religious activities, and more of their families are satisfied with the community in which they live.

b. More of them attended a rural high school, fewer earned bachelor's and master's degrees in Florida, fewer have bachelor's and master's degrees, fewer have taught in a four-year college, more have taught in elementary or secondary schools, have more teaching experience in junior colleges and elementary or secondary schools, and more have had courses and in-service training related to junior college teaching and purposes.

c. Group is made up of more administrators and fewer counselors and teachers, fewer have attempted to locate another job, and teaching and non-teaching personnel in the group earn higher salaries.

d. More are satisfied with junior college work as a career, more prefer to teach in a junior college to any other level, more expect to remain in junior college work until retirement, more favor the principle of merit pay, fewer favor faculty rank, more favor "Community Junior College" as part of the nomenclature of their institution.

e. Most have no dissatisfactions with junior college work; more are satisfied with junior college work and list their main satisfactions as enjoyment of teaching, helping young people grow, freedom and independence of work, personal satisfaction, and sense of social usefulness;

more are satisfied with administrative procedures, pay and student load, and place more emphasis on better facilities and more prestige for teachers.

f. More accept all of the usual functions of a comprehensive junior college, but still half or less accept elderly citizens courses and high school completion courses; more favor open admission policy to all courses.

g. More believe classroom teachers should spend time on personal counseling, more disagree that junior colleges spend too much time on personal problem counseling; more believe faculty members should participate in student extracurricular activities and more do participate often in such activities; and more believe that counseling of all types is equally as important as academic instruction.

h. More are satisfied with all features, policies, programs, activities, and facilities of their own junior college, since this was the basis for selecting members of the satisfied and dissatisfied groups.

i. Greatest difference or spread on satisfaction between the two groups are: college organization and administrative procedures, faculty participation in institutional policy-formulation and decision-making, effectiveness of faculty handbook, faculty participation in curriculum development, and effectiveness of faculty meetings.

The more significant conclusions drawn from the study can be summarized as: there have been numerous changes, but few of major proportions, in the backgrounds, attitudes, and opinions of Florida community junior college faculties; no specific pattern of background experience and educational preparation was identified as an "ideal mix" for good faculty members; in general, the satisfied faculty member contributed more than the dissatisfied one to achieving the objectives and purposes of the Florida comprehensive community junior college; there seems to be a minority group of faculty members who are satisfied with the status quo and have no desire to change or improve the effectiveness of their college; the majority of the faculty is relatively satisfied with his profession, his working conditions, his community, his associates, and his students; there are divergent views on the role of teachers and counselors in advising and counseling students on academic, personal, and career problems; there is less concern than in 1962 with importance of additional pay raises and more concern about the teaching situation and conditions; the majority of the faculty have not had formal or informal training designed specifically to improve junior college teaching or understanding role and philosophy in a comprehensive junior college; a significant area of dissatisfaction concerns college organization and administrative procedures, faculty participation in institutional policy-formulation and decision-making, and adequacy of communications; and, in terms of academic degrees and specific training for junior college work, faculty qualifications have dropped since 1962.

Recommendations developed from the study may be summarized as: faculty improvement programs should be strengthened at the college and state level; positive steps should be taken by colleges to improve communications, organization, administrative procedures, and a sense of participation in institutional affairs by faculty members; teacher dissatisfaction with their teaching situation and their requests for a lighter teaching load, lower student-teacher ratio, better facilities, etc. should be recognized and priorities established to improve these conditions as resources can be made available; a state-wide study is needed to clarify and establish guidelines or roles and responsibilities for the counseling and guidance function; expanded institutional research is needed in some colleges; data collected in this study should be used as a basis for additional studies which are needed; a state-wide study on characteristics, attitudes and opinions of students should be made; the implication that there are several sub-classifications of "satisfied" and "dissatisfied" faculty members should be investigated further; and, due to further changes expected in faculty backgrounds, attitudes and opinions, this study should be repeated in five years to provide current information on these changes.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The establishment and phenomenal growth of the Florida community junior college system is one of the classic examples of a planned effort to meet the higher education needs of the citizens of a state. In 1957-58 there were five public junior college areas in Florida having a total enrollment of less than 6,000 students and having only 230 full-time and 113 part-time faculty members (32, p. 114). In the fall of 1967, there were twenty-six junior college areas enrolling 87,835 students (1, p. 69) and having 3,260 full-time and 680 part-time faculty members (34). Much of the credit for developing the basic plan for the Florida community junior college systems goes to Dr. James L. Wattenbarger (36), who also supervised its development as Director, Division of Community Junior Colleges, Florida State Department of Education.

This rapid growth, with a concurrent effort to maintain academic excellence and at the same time be responsive to the educational needs of communities served, has not been without problems. One of the more difficult problems has been recruiting, developing, and retaining a competent and dedicated faculty.

Any discussion of junior college problems or issues will inevitably include how they affect the faculty. Faculty qualifications, performance, attitudes, opinions, and aspirations are so interwoven in the fabric of the institution that they are crucial considerations bearing on any decision concerning any part of the institution.

The vital role of the staff and faculty in a junior college was expressed very well by Williams in a 1961 address to a group of junior college administrators:

> Personnel, more than any other factor, indeed more than all other factors combined, determines the achievement and the success of the junior college, as indeed it would of any institutional organization. To be sure, sound organization is important, but personnel will determine whether the organization is effective or ineffective in its translation.
>
> Educational goals and programs of the institution are completely dependent upon the personnel factor, both in the creation and in the translation of these educational goals, and no matter what programs are devised it is the faculty (the personnel) of the institution that will determine whether these are translated effectively. The selection and wise utilization of personnel is surely

> recognized as the most critical issue faced by our boards, and by our administrative officers, upon whom repose responsibilities for our junior colleges. The personnel factor indeed is the factor of critical incidence in any over-all appraisal of the institution. The success of the institution hinges on this.
>
> . . . If there is any single task of the President that far overshadows all other tasks, it is, in my opinion, that of setting the stage so that every individual who is employed has the opportunity to achieve his full potential in both personal satisfaction and in service to the institution. None of us do this perfectly, but this is one goal of administrative organization and work with our faculty towards which we must work very diligently (37, pp. 33-34).

Hunt, in an address to a group of newly appointed junior college presidents, stressed the importance of the faculty to the success of a junior college:

> The selection of instructional staff becomes a role of major importance when it is recognized that no college can be any stronger than its faculty. Classroom instructors possessed with such qualities as scholarship, enthusiasm for learning and instruction in the classroom, interest in the welfare and progress of students, and loyalty to the program of the college are what transform an ordinary college into a great institution (13, p. 31).

Merson told a 1964 institute of junior college administrators that securing, retaining and inspiring instructors is one of the more difficult and perplexing administrative problems faced in a junior college. He said: "Given an adequate system of community colleges and visionary leadership in these colleges, no other factor is more important to the success of the college than its instructors" (25, pp. 11-12).

Kinsinger (17, p. 32), Schroeder (30, p. 81), Reynolds (29, pp. 6-14), Crossland (7, p. 3), Medsker (24, Chap. 7), Garrison (9), and numerous others have also stressed the importance of faculty competence and attitudes to the success of junior colleges.

Another trend which has been investigated and discussed by Kiernan (16, p. 36), Johnson (15, p. 43), Lahti (20), Honer (12), Lombardi (22), and others is the growing trend among junior college faculty members to insist on greater participation in policy-formulation and decision-making with respect to all phases of the college program. As early as 1961, Johns (14, pp. 1-5) presented a pattern for faculty participation to a group of junior college administrators.

These developments raise the question: "If recruiting, retaining, and developing a professionally competent and dedicated faculty for Florida's rapidly growing junior college system are so vital to quality education in these institutions, and if faculty insistence on participation in policy-formulation and decision-making is increasing, what could be more useful to our junior college administrators than current and accurate information about the faculties and their attitudes and opinions?" A state-wide comprehensive study of the Florida community junior college faculties has not been made since 1962 (27). The Division of Community Junior Colleges, Florida State Department of Education, has affirmed on several occasions that current information on the Florida community junior college faculty is not now available and is needed to assist in better management of the Florida junior college system. This study was designed, in part, to fulfill this requirement.

Statement of the Problem

The Problem

The specific problem in this study is to answer the question: "What are the areas of satisfactions and dissatisfactions of faculty members in Florida community junior colleges with respect to various features, activities, programs, policies, organization, and conditions in their own college; and what are the characteristics, opinions, and attitudes of those most satisfied and those most dissatisfied?"

Sub-Problems

In arriving at a solution to the major problem, answers to the following questions were sought:

a. What are the current specific backgrounds, experience, and quantifiable characteristics of faculty members in Florida's community junior colleges?

b. What are the current attitudes and opinions of faculty members on various matters having to do with their personal and work situations?

c. To what extent do faculty members understand and accept stated purposes and functions of the Florida community junior college?

d. What are the attitudes and opinions of faculty members toward the counseling and guidance functions in Florida community junior colleges?

e. What are the attitudes and opinions of the faculty members on the organization, programs, policies, and operating procedures in the Florida community junior college?

f. In terms of total responses, how do current backgrounds, characteristics, attitudes, and opinions differ with those found in the survey conducted by Montgomery (27) in 1962?

g. What are the areas of satisfactions and dissatisfactions of faculty members with various features and conditions in their own junior college, and what are the characteristics and opinion patterns of those satisfied and of those dissatisfied?

h. What valid conclusions and recommendations can be drawn from findings of this study which might be useful to junior college officials at all levels for initiating changes in legislation, policies, programs, financial support, operating procedures, organizational structure, and/or facilities?

Need for the Study

1. One part of a comprehensive survey (27), conducted under the supervision of the Florida State Junior College Advisory Board in 1962, identified many of the characteristics, competencies, attitudes, and opinions of faculty members in Florida's community junior colleges at that time. This survey resulted in several useful and valuable recommendations for improving the climate and effectiveness of faculty performance in Florida's community junior colleges based on the situation at that time.

2. The 1962 study of faculty opinions included fourteen white junior colleges, only five of which had been in operation more than five years. Fifty-five per cent of the faculty had taught in a junior college two years or less (27, p. 95). With the maturing of Florida's community colleges, it was considered likely that faculty characteristics and opinions were different and should be recorded and compared at the present time.

3. No regular system now exists for reporting changes in junior college faculty backgrounds, opinions, and attitudes to the State Department of Education. Hence, a current survey for use by officials at all levels is needed.

4. There has been some attrition of faculty members in the junior colleges which existed in 1962, and full-time faculty members have increased from 1,025 to almost 3,300 in the fall of 1967 (34). It is estimated that about 80 per cent of current full-time faculty members have been hired since 1962 (questions 75 and 76, Appendix B). This drastic change in faculty population was another reason making an up-to-date study necessary.

5. Larger percentages of newer faculty members have been hired direct from graduate schools and from business and the professions (26, pp. 7-10), which added to the probability that faculty characteristics, attitudes, and opinions may have changed significantly in some areas.

6. As community junior colleges grow larger and more complex, direct communication between top administrators and individual faculty members becomes more difficult, and may result in misunderstanding or ignorance of faculty attitudes and opinions. In such cases, a current survey should provide clues as to action needed for improving faculty morale and effectiveness.

7. No comprehensive study has been conducted since 1962 on the backgrounds, characteristics, attitudes, and opinions of Florida community junior college faculty members. A recent study sponsored by American Association of Junior Colleges (20) identified a trend among faculty members to demand better pay and facilities and a

greater voice in the making of institutional policies and decisions. The Florida junior college presidents have recognized a trend toward faculty insistence on an increased role in decision- and policy-making as evidenced by discussion of the problem at recent meetings of that group.

8. All of these symptoms pointed to a change in faculty characteristics, attitudes, and opinions. This study was designed to identify some of these changes, highlight the differences between 1962 and the present, and provide an analysis of faculty satisfactions and dissatisfactions with their own institution.

Delimitations

The faculty profile and analyses accomplished in this study were limited to full-time faculty members of Florida's community junior colleges who responded to a prepared questionnaire.

Because of the large increase in the faculty population (33, p. 26 and 1, pp. 20-23) and inability to identify how each faculty member participating in the 1962 survey answered particular questions, comparisons between the data from the 1962 and current surveys were made in terms of gross differences on a state-wide basis.

Analyses made in the state-wide profile of faculty backgrounds, experience, attitudes, and opinions were limited to comparisons with results of the 1962 survey and other research studies included in the Related Research section of this chapter.

Analyses accomplished on satisfactions and dissatisfactions of faculty members with conditions and features of their own institution were limited to comparison of the personal and educational backgrounds and attitudes of the most satisfied group with the most dissatisfied group.

Related Research

The research most closely related to this study was done in 1962 by Montgomery while a doctoral candidate at Florida State University (27). The study was sponsored by the Florida State Junior College Advisory Board. The Montgomery study surveyed all faculty members in fourteen white Florida public community junior colleges and obtained information on personal and educational backgrounds, attitudes on junior college work in general, opinions on their own institutions, attitudes toward various aspects of guidance and counseling programs, and attitudes on stated functions of the Florida public junior colleges. A comprehensive summary of the personal data for the total sample is presented in his report, followed by an analysis of factors which characterize the "accepting" and "rejecting" groups. The terms "accepting" and "rejecting" relate to the stated purposes of Florida's public junior colleges.

Montgomery found that among the factors characterizing the "accepting" group as compared to the "rejecting" group were the following: they were younger and a higher proportion of them had taught in secondary schools; they tended to come from families of modest means; they were more enthusiastic about their work and about helping younger people learn; they were less interested in the title of "professor," but more of them wanted the word "community" in the name of their institution; they believed more strongly in counseling and guidance and more of them recommended extensive use of professionally trained guidance personnel; they gave greater acceptance to the "open-door" admission policy; and they were less likely to have outstanding academic records.

The Florida Junior College Advisory Board submitted a comprehensive report to the State Department of Education in February, 1963 (33), setting forth current conditions in Florida community junior colleges and making recommendations for needed improvements. One section of this report (pages 26-33) contains a summary of the data used by Montgomery in his dissertation and makes seven recommendations for improvements related to the junior college faculties.

Lipscomb in 1965 made a study of faculties in the fourteen white Mississippi public junior colleges (21). This study was almost identical to the Montgomery study. The study showed that among the factors characterizing the "accepting" group as compared with the "rejecting" group were the following: they were younger and a higher proportion of them were female; they came from a small Mississippi town and attended school there; they were more likely to have outstanding academic records and to have had formal courses and in-service training related to junior college teaching; they majored in foreign languages, English, social science, guidance, home economics, or industrial or vocational arts; they devoted more hours per week to their junior college duties; they were very satisfied with junior college work and felt a sense of social usefulness and personal satisfaction from junior college work; they believed in the importance of all types of counseling; and they accepted the multi-purpose functions of the junior college with equal emphasis on those functions (21, pp. 91-92).

Medsker (24) in 1957 made an extensive study and reported in some detail on the backgrounds and the academic preparation for teaching of junior college faculty members, as well as their attitudes and opinions on various topics. He obtained responses from 3,274 faculty members associated with seventy-four junior colleges in fifteen states. The relationship between attitudes held by faculty members and the type of institution and position held was examined. Although none of Florida's community junior colleges were included in Medsker's sample, this study was a landmark in the study of junior college faculty characteristics, attitudes, and opinions on a nation-wide basis. It is interesting to note that Medsker found that the groups of faculty members most likely to support the objectives and program of the community college concept were: those with administrative responsibilities; those who had secondary school teaching experience; those who indicated a preference for teaching at the junior college level; and those employed in public junior colleges rather than extension centers and private junior colleges.

An extensive study of the academic preparation, teaching experience and workload of junior college faculty members was done by McDowell in 1919 (23, pp. 53-56). Similar data were gathered by Koos in 1925 (18, pp. 77-89) and again by Koos in 1940-41, but not published until after World War II (19). In this study, published in 1947, Koos reported on the degrees held by junior college faculty members, the amount of resident preparation, and on the subject areas of the preparation.

In 1953, Colvert and Litton studied the academic preparation of junior college personnel and reported the highest degree held (6, pp. 5-10). Two years later, Colvert and Baker reported similar data (5, pp. 10-14). Thorton, in his book, The Community Junior College, summarized all of these reports (35, p. 136). These reports show a steady increase in the percentage of faculty members holding the doctor's degree and a rise in the percentage with the master's degree from approximately 40 per cent in 1918 to approximately 65 per cent in 1958. As reported by Montgomery (27), a higher percentage of Florida community junior college full-time members had earned advanced degrees with 13 per cent holding doctorates and more than 93 per cent with at least a master's degree.

In 1961, Eckert and Stecklein reported an extensive study of college teachers in the state of Minnesota (8). This study included both the senior institutions and the junior colleges in Minnesota, and contained considerable data on faculty job satisfaction. A study of college teachers in the southeastern states was reported by Gustad in 1960. His report was concerned primarily with teacher retirement, but included data on parental background of college teachers (11).

In 1963, Siehr, Jamrich, and Hereford (31) made a nation-wide survey to identify the kinds of problems perceived by new faculty members in community colleges. A total of 3,220 questionnaires was returned from 429 comunity colleges, a return of 57 per cent. This study revealed some interesting biographical and background data and found that new faculty members perceived the following as their most critical and persistent problems: lack of time for scholarly study; adapting instruction to individual differences; dealing wtih students who require special attention to overcome deficiencies; acquiring adequate secretarial help. instructional materials; grading or marking students' work; and understanding college policies to be followed in curriculum development and revision (31, p. 26).

During 1965-66, Garrison (9) traveled to twenty junior colleges and interviewed over 650 junior college teachers concerning the setting in which they work and the basic issues and problems in junior colleges as seen by the teacher. He found that junior college teachers: (a) consider their most pressing professional problem to be lack of time to properly perform their teaching and other assigned duties and at the same time keep up in their academic field; (b) consider the main faculty concern to be lack of opportunity to participate in decisions and policies which affect them as professionals; (c) consider the chief issue affecting them to be the administrative context in which they work and tendency on the part of administration to be tradition-bound confused in its aims, unimaginative, and too typically inflexible; and (d) consider their other problems and concerns to be lack of communication between faculty groups and between the administration and faculty, a trend toward rigid curricula, a trend toward rigid faculty preparation and certification requirements, lack of sabbatical and other leave policies to permit professional improvement efforts, and articulation difficulties with four-year colleges and universities.

In 1966, Burnette (3) conducted a study of the internal organizational structures of nine public junior colleges in Florida, and, in general, found that organization, decision-making, and administrative behavior within the colleges tended to be more bureaucratic than collegial. Atwell (2), in a 1968 study, found that certain institutional and community characteristics were related to the effectiveness of transfer programs in Florida public junior colleges, as measured by graduation rate of their transfer students from a four-year institution in the Florida university system within three years after transfer. He indentified community characteristics showing the strongest relationship with "effectiveness" as: current expenses per pupil and per instructional unit in the public schools of the junior college district; and educational level of the district's population; the ratio to male and female teachers in the district (negatively related); per capita income of the district; per cent of "non-white" population in the district; and number of high school graduates in the district. His study showed that the best institutional discriminators were: average junior college faculty salaries; upper-division university attended by transferring students; library circulation per student; certification level of junior college faculty; and ratio of full-time equivalent enrollment to the number of annual graduates (2).

Procedures

General Design

Data for this study were collected by use of a questionnaire (Appendix B) completed by faculty members employed in Florida's twenty-six community junior colleges. The Division of Community Junior Colleges, Florida State Department of Education, approved the project and requested junior college presidents to cooperate in the conduct of the study. Analyses were accomplished by use of an IBM 360 computer.

Population

The population used in this study included all part-time and full-time faculty members of Florida's community junior college system. For purposes of this study, the term "faculty member" included all teachers, administrators, and counselors, but excluded clerical and "blue collar" personnel. The colleges requested and were furnished 4,289 copies of the questionnaire for distribution to their faculty members. Detailed analysis was limited to full-time faculty members, since they were considered to be the core of personnel who are principally responsible for determining the quality and effectiveness of each institution in carrying out its objectives and purposes.

The Instrument

The instrument employed in this study (Appendix B) is a modified version of the one constructed for use in the 1962 survey conducted under auspices of the Florida State Junior College Advisory Board. It was developed by Montgomery (27), pp. 79-111) using items taken from the 1961 Florida State University Role and Scope Project, Eckert and Stecklein's study of faculty members in Minnesota colleges (8), Medsker's instrument which formed the basis for part of the book, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect (24), and supplemented by original questions having application to Florida community junior colleges. The preliminary instrument was reviewed by five faculty members from different junior colleges, revised, and field tested. Lipscomb (21) in 1965 used a shortened version of the same instrument in Mississippi. The decision to use the same basic instrument for this study was based on: (a) the fact that it was validated and used successfully in the 1962 survey and that there has been little change in the basic organization, purposes, aims, and policies governing operation of Florida community junior colleges; and (b) a direct comparison could be made of certain responses to the 1962 survey with those obtained from the present survey. The modifications made to the 1962 instrument for this study included deletion of fifty-six questions and addition of eleven new ones. The questions deleted included several of a personal nature which might have tended to inhibit faculty members' completion of the questionnaire, and some others which did not seem essential for purposes of this study. The questions added were concerned mostly with organization, procedures, and faculty participation in policy-formulation and decision-making.

The instrument, as revised, contained 220 items on faculty personal background, attitudes on junior college work in general, attitudes and opinions on their own institutions, attitudes toward various aspects of the guidance program in the junior college, and related data. The 220 questions contained a total of 1,347 alternatives. The instrument was designed so that responses on each question could be punched on four IBM cards for processing by computer.

Collection of the Data

Copies of the instrument together with appropriate instructions were sent to each junior college president, who was responsible for distributing a copy to each of his faculty members. To assure anonymity of individual respondents, each was asked to complete the instrument and mail it direct to the Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida. A separate card was provided for each respondent to send to his college president indicating that he had completed and mailed the survey instrument. Two follow-up letters were sent, and college presidents were asked to use these cards as a means of identifying non-respondents, and to encourage them to complete the questionnaire. Each completed instrument was reviewed by a team under supervision of the writers for consistency and completeness, and a determination made on each instrument as to whether it was suitable for use in the tabulation of results.

A total of 4,289 instruments was furnished to and retained by the junior colleges. A total of 3,022 was completed and returned--2,752 from full-time faculty members and 270 from part-time faculty members. Of the 3,022 returned, 2,641 from full-time faculty members and 248 from part-time faculty members were coded and tabulated, while 133 were determined to be unsuitable for coding or were received too late for processing. Records in the Division of Community Junior Colleges, Florida State Department of Education, indicate that in the fall of 1968 there were approximately 3,520 full-time faculty members in the twenty-six Florida community junior colleges included in this study, making an overall response of 78.2 per cent from full-time faculty members.

Analysis of the Data

Initially a separate frequency distribution of responses to each question was tabulated for (a) all full-time faculty members, (b) all part-time faculty members, and (c) full-time faculty members by institution. Each junior college president was furnished a copy of the frequency distribution of responses from his full-time faculty members.

Based on the frequency distribution obtained from tabulation of all full-time faculty responses, a profile of the junior college faculty was developed (Chapter II). Appropriate comparisons were made with findings of Montgomery (27), Lipscomb (21), Medsker (24), and others. An attempt was made to draw inferences from items which reflected significant differences between these studies.

The analysis made in Chapter III of this study was a comparison of the differences in the backgrounds, experience, opinions, and attitudes of those faculty members most satisfied and most dissatisfied with various conditions, programs, policies, activities, organization, and features of their own junior college. The "satisfied" group was made up of 454 (about one-sixth of the total) full-time faculty members who, by their responses to fifty-nine questions (numbered 167-225) in the survey instrument, indicated the highest degree of satisfaction with a variety of features and conditions in their own junior colleges. The make-up of the "dissatisfied" group was 444 (about one-sixth) full-time faculty members who, by their responses to the same questions, indicated the highest degree of dissatisfaction. For purposes of separating the two groups by cumulative scores, weighted values were assigned to responses as follows:

a.	Entirely satisfied, entirely adequate, very good	5 points
b.	Reasonably satisfied, about right, fairly adequate, good	4 points
c.	Mixed feelings, average	3 points
d.	Somewhat dissatisfied, inadequate, too much, too little, poor	2 points
e.	Completely dissatisfied, completely inadequate, far too much, far too little, very poor.	1 point

Based on values indicated above, the respondents were rank ordered based on their cumulative scores and the one-sixth with the highest (satisfied) scores was selected for the "satisfied" group and the one-sixth with the lowest scores (dissatisfied) was selected for the "dissatisfied" group. A comparison was made of the responses of the two groups and inferences were drawn where appropriate.

From the analyses described above, an effort was made to identify implications and to formulate recommendations for Florida junior college administrators at all levels for improvement of faculty selection, development, morale, and effectiveness.

CHAPTER II

PROFILE OF THE FACULTY

The responses of 2,641 full-time faculty members from the twenty-six Florida community junior colleges, which had been in operation for one year or more, are summarized and analyzed in this chapter. Appendix A is a list of the twenty-six participating junior colleges.

The chapter is divided into sections providing information concerning the faculty member and his family, background data on parents, the faculty member--youth through college, previous educational experience, general working conditions, attitude toward functions of the community junior colleges, attitude toward counseling and guidance functions, degree of satisfaction with own junior college, the "typical" junior college faculty member, and faculty trends in Florida community junior colleges.

The tables which follow in this chapter reflect the percentage distribution of responses from the participants in the current survey (hereafter referred to as the current or 1968 survey) and the study made by Montgomery (27) in 1962 (hereafter referred to as the 1962 study). Although the Montgomery survey was based on responses from 797 faculty members in fourteen Florida community junior colleges, it did represent a composite picture of the faculty in 1962. Hence, the comparative percentages from the 1962 and 1968 studies represent an overall view of the Florida community junior college faculty at those times. It should be noted that the percentages set forth in the tables do not always total 100 since some questions were not answered by all respondents. This chapter does not contain a tabultation of responses to every item included in the questionnaire; however the questionnaire together with a complete tabulation of responses by percentages is included as Appendix B to this study.

The Faculty Member and His Family

The distribution of positions occupied by the 2,641 full-time faculty member respondents is set forth in Table 1 under the column headed "1968." The distribution of positions reported by Montgomery (27, p. 17) is listed in Table 1 under the column entitled "1962." As the table indicates, there was a small increase in the percentage of teachers and counselors and a small decrease in the percentage of administrators. There was also a decrease in the percentage of faculty members occupying dual roles. These Florida distributions are similar to Lipscomb's findings (21, p. 16) in Mississippi of 67 per cent full-time teachers, 12 per cent full-time administrators, and 3 per cent full-time counselors. Medsker's study (24, p. 171) reported 68 per cent full-time teachers, but only 6 per cent full-time administrators and 1 per cent full-time counselors.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME POSITIONS IN FLORIDA COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES

Position	Per Cent 1968	Per Cent 1962
Full-time teacher	71.8	68.0
Full-time administrator	12.7	14.0
Part-time teacher--part-time administrator	9.4	11.0
Full-time counselor	4.0	2.5
Part-time teacher--part-time counselor	1.3	2.9
Part-time administrator--part-time counselor	.8	.9

The age range of the faculty, as reflected in Table 2, is remarkably uniform in its distribution. Seventy-four per cent reported that they were between 29 and 49 years of age, as compared to 77 per cent in the same age grouping in 1962. The average age of the faculty member is approximately 41.6 years as compared to approximately 40.8 in 1962. There is a slightly higher percentage in age groups 20-29 and 50-54 than in 1962. This can, in part, be explained by aging of veteran faculty members, the higher percentage of younger personnel being hired direct from graduate school, and the higher percentage of older personnel being hired from among armed forces retirees. By way of comparison, Lipscomb (21, p. 55) found the average age of faculty in white Mississippi public junior colleges to be 40 years.

The respondents reported that 68.4 per cent in their number were male as compared to 66 per cent in 1962. Lipscomb (21, p. 17) reported 62 per cent in the Mississippi faculty were male, and the Medsker study (24, p. 171) reported 72 per cent were men.

Previous military service was reported by 48.4 per cent of the respondents, as compared to 54 per cent in 1962. On the other hand, faculty members drawing retirement pay from the armed forces increased from 5 per cent in 1962 to 9.5 per cent in 1968.

As reflected in Table 3, a slightly higher percentage of faculty members reported they were married than in 1962, with a small decrease in all categories of non-married personnel.

TABLE 2

AGE RANGE FOR FLORIDA COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY

Age Range	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
20-24	3.5	2.0
25-29	13.7	12.0
30-34	13.4	16.0
35-39	13.4	17.0
40-44	15.8	16.0
45-49	14.3	14.0
50-54	13.0	9.0
55-59	7.0	7.0
60-over	5.4	5.0
Average	41.6	40.8

TABLE 3

MARITAL STATUS OF FACULTY MEMBERS

	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
Single	16.3	19.0
Married	74.6	72.0
Divorced or otherwise separated	5.8	6.0
Widowed	1.7	2.0

The number of children per faculty family is relatively small, but has shown a slight increase since 1962. As shown in Table 4, the most frequently reported number of children was two in 1962 and 1968. Only 10.8 per cent of the respondents reported having four or more children, as compared with 8.1 per cent in 1962.

A slightly higher percentage of the respondents reported that their spouses had earned bachelor's and advanced degrees than was the case in 1962. Table 5 shows a comparison of educational levels attained by spouses in 1962 and 1968.

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN FAMILIES

Number	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
1	16.3	18.0
2	25.7	26.0
3	15.7	11.0
4	6.8	5.0
5	2.7	2.0
6	.7	.6
7 or more	.6	.5
none	29.8	36.0

TABLE 5

GRADE LEVEL COMPLETED BY SPOUSES

Level Completed	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
8th grade or less	.7	.4
High school--non-graduate	2.6	2.0
High school--graduate	13.3	13.0
College--non-graduate	22.5	24.0

TABLE 5 (continued)

Level Completed	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
Bachelors's degree	22.6	22.0
Master's degree	12.0	11.0
Medical, Law, Divinity, etc.	2.8	1.8
Ph.D. or Ed.D. or other educational doctorate	2.3	1.4
No spouse	20.1	24.0

One of the most striking changes revealed in the current survey was the large increase in teacher salaries since 1962. Table 6 shows that 92.7 per cent of the full-time teachers earn $7,500 or more, while in 1962 only 7 per cent earned more than this amount. Although the data are not grouped to permit precise calculations of median or average salary, it is estimated that the median salary for 1968 is $9,250, as compared with the $5,830 for 1961-62, as reported by the Florida State Department of Education (33, p. 32).

TABLE 6

SALARY RANGE FOR FULL-TIME TEACHERS FOR TEN MONTHS NORMAL TEACHING LOAD

Salary Range	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
$6,000 or less	.8	70.5
6,500	2.1	14.0
7,000	4.4	8.0
7,500	7.5	7.0[a]
8,000	12.5	

[a] Earned salary of $7,500 or more.

TABLE 6 (continued)

Salary Range	Per Cent 1968	 1962
8,500	11.4	
9,000	12.4	
9,500	18.4	
10,500 or more	30.5	

Faculty members whose duties were not primarily teaching had a similar large increase in salary from 1962 to 1968. Table 7 shows under its "1968" column the percentage of the 586 respondents to this question falling into each of the 17 salary categories listed. In 1968 about 83 per cent of the respondents earned $10,000 or more as compared to 20 per cent in 1962. The 1968 median salary fell within the group reporting a $12,000 annual salary, whereas, in 1962 the median fell within the group reporting an $8,000 salary.

With respect to their present residence, 69.9 per cent of the respondents reported that they owned or were buying, 26.5 per cent that they were renting, and 1.3 per cent "other." The 1962 study reported that 67 per cent owned or were buying, 31 per cent were renting, and 1.5 per cent "other." These data indicate that a few more faculty members are purchasing their homes, but the change does not appear large enough to establish a significant trend.

Fewer faculty members reported that they participate regularly in religious and social activities of a church than in 1962. Table 8 illustrates this decrease.

Slightly less than half of the respondents reported that they belonged to one or more civic organizations. As indicated in Table 9 there was a slight decrease from 1962 in the percentage of faculty members belonging to civic organizations. This may be due partly to the increase in numbers of faculty members being hired direct from graduate school; and partly to hiring increased numbers of armed forces retirees, who may not have participated in civic organizations due to frequent transfers.

Between 1962 and 1968 there was a small increase in the percentage of faculty members belonging to professional or scholarly organizations pertaining to their subject matter area. Over 90 per cent reported that they belonged to one or more such organizations, as compared with 89 per cent in 1962. These percentages are shown in Table 10.

Respondents reported that a smaller percentage of them belonged to national, regional, and state educational organizations of a general nature than in 1962. In addition, a considerably smaller percentage belonged to more than one such organization. Table 11 reflects this change.

TABLE 7

ANNUAL SALARY RANGE FOR NON-TEACHING FACULTY

Salary Range	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
$4,000 or less	1.5	2.0
5,000	.3	8.0
6,000	.2	13.0
7,000	1.4	21.0
8,000	4.4	23.0
9,000	9.0	14.0
10,000	10.3	7.0
11,000	10.4	2.0
12,000	16.6	5.0
13,000	12.2	2.0
14,000	9.6	3.0
15,000	6.8	.5
16,000	5.1	0.0
17,000	5.6	.5[a]
18,000	2.0	
19,000	1.0	
20,000 or more	3.4	

[a] Earned $17,000 or more.

TABLE 8

PARTICIPATION IN CHURCH ACTIVITIES

Participation	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
Regularly	39.4	47.0
Often	13.3	15.0
Not very often	16.3	16.0
Seldom	15.7	13.0
Never	14.5	7.0

TABLE 9

PARTICIPATION IN CIVIC GROUPS

Number of Civic Groups	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
1	23.4	27.0
2	12.5	10.0
3	4.8	6.0
4	1.9	1.9
5 or more	1.8	1.9
none	55.1	52.0

TABLE 10

MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Number of Professional Organizations	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
1	22.0	19.0
2	28.4	26.0
3	19.8	21.0
4	9.8	10.0
5 or more	10.4	13.0
none	9.4	11.0

TABLE 11

MEMBERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Number of Educational Organizations	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
1	30.2	19.0
2	22.8	30.0
3	16.1	29.0
4	7.0	9.0
5 or more	4.7	5.0
none	18.7	7.0

In response to the question of how they spent their time during the summer sessions, one-half of the faculty reported they were on a 12-month salary basis or taught in their own college. Another 15.6 per cent checked two or more of the choices available, one of which was usually "Teaching at your own school." The faculty responses to this question in the 1962 and 1968 surveys follow in Table 12.

TABLE 12

UTILIZATION OF TIME DURING SUMMER SESSIONS

Utilization of Time--Summer Sessions	Per Cent 1968	Per Cent 1962
Teaching at own school	24.2	30.0
Teaching at another school	.7	1.8
Working in industry	1.3	3.5
Rest and relax	7.1	8.0
Attend graduate school	7.9	18.0
Travel	7.8	7.0
On 12-month salary basis	25.5	19.0
Other	7.4	11.0
Combination of two or more of above choices	15.6	

Eighty-six per cent of the respondents reported that their families are satisfied or very satisfied with the community in which they live. This is a slight increase in degree of satisfaction reported in 1962, as depicted by Table 13.

Background Data on Parents

The respondents reported that only 17 per cent of their fathers had lived most of their lives in Florida. Another 19 per cent spent most of their lives in the southeast (other than in Florida). The remainder spent most of their lives in: 8.4 per cent in Mid-Atlantic states, 19.3 per cent in the northeast, 7.2 per cent in the south central states, 19.9 per cent in the north central states, 3.1 per cent in the southwest, 1.2 per cent in the northwest, and 3 per cent in a foreign country. The pattern for the respondents' mothers was almost identical to that of their fathers. The 1962 study of Florida community junior college faculty reflected a similar distribution of parental backgrounds,

TABLE 13

FAMILY SATISFACTION WITH COMMUNITY

Family Satisfaction with Community	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
Very satisfied	49.9	47.0
Satisfied	36.2	35.0
Indifferent	5.3	7.0
Dissatisfied	5.4	8.0
Very dissatisfied	1.5	1.0

with 15 per cent of both parents having spend most of their lives in Florida, and another 23 per cent in the southeast (other than Florida). An interesting contrast was found by Lipscomb (21, p. 25) in Mississippi where 78 per cent of the fathers and 76 per cent of the mothers had lived most of their lives in Mississippi.

A wide range of occupations was reported by faculty members in response to the question requesting information of their fathers' major lifetime occupation. These responses are shown in Table 14.

TABLE 14

FATHERS' OCCUPATION

Occupation	Per Cent
Work in primary, secondary, or college level education	4.6
Professional (other than education) or scientific	14.8
Business owner or executive	26.8
Farm owner or renter	10.0
Clerk or salesman	7.2
Skilled worker or foreman	20.3

TABLE 14 (continued)

FATHERS' OCCUPATIONS

Occupation	Per Cent
Semi-skilled worker	5.5
Unskilled worker or farm laborer	2.4
Other	7.6

A similar, but not identical question, was asked in the 1962 survey. The respondents to that survey indicated their fathers' occupations as: work in primary or secondary education--2.1 per cent, work in college or university--2.8 per cent, professional (other than education)--16 per cent, owner of a farm--12 per cent, owner of a business--24 per cent, salaried (upper income level)--14 per cent, salaried (lower income level)--21 per cent, and salesman--6 per cent. The distribution of fathers' occupations in the 1962 and 1968 surveys is not directly comparable because of differences in available responses; however, the distribution patterns are similar. The most apparent difference noted is the significant drop in the percentage of fathers who were unskilled or lower-salaried workers.

The respondents were asked if their mothers worked regularly, and reported that 21.7 per cent worked full-time, 9.1 per cent worked part-time, and 64.3 per cent did not work regularly. In the 1962 survey, participating faculty members reported that 18 per cent of their mothers worked full-time, 7 per cent part-time, and 67 per cent did not work regularly. This is consistent with the national trend of an increasing number of women working full-or part-time outside the home.

The grade level completed by parents of faculty members shows a remarkable similarity when the data from the 1968 and 1962 surveys are compared. For example, the 1968 survey reflects that 19.5 per cent of the fathers had completed at least a bachelor's degree as compared to 19.4 per cent in 1962. Similarly, 12.7 per cent of the mothers were reported to have completed at least a bachelor's degree in 1962 and 1968. The 1968 survey indicated that 34 per cent of the fathers and 30.2 per cent of the mothers had attended some college, while the 1962 survey reported 36.4 per cent of the fathers and 30.7 per cent of the mothers completed some college work. A comparison of the grade levels completed by fathers and mothers of faculty members, as reported in the 1968 and 1962 surveys,is set forth in Table 15.

TABLE 15

GRADE LEVEL COMPLETED BY FATHER AND MOTHER

Grade Level Completed	Per Cent			
	Father		Mother	
	1968	1962	1968	1962
8th grade or less	29.8	30.0	23.6	24.0
High school, non-graduate	15.2	15.0	15.2	18.0
High school, graduated	19.7	18.0	28.8	27.0
College, 1 year only	6.1	5.0	8.0	6.0
College, non-graduate	8.4	12.0	9.5	12.0
Bachelor's degree	9.2	7.0	9.5	10.0
Master's degree	3.0	2.4	2.2	2.0
Medical, law, divinity, etc.	5.5	8.0	.8	.6
Ph.D., Ed.D. or other educational doctorate	1.8	2.0	.2	.1

The Faculty Member--Youth through College

The respondents reported that 22.4 per cent of their number spent the major part of their youth before college in Florida, while an additional 18.3 per cent lived in other southeastern states during the major part of their youth. Another 18.4 per cent spent most of their youth in the north central states, and 17.9 per cent lived most of this period in the northeastern states. The remainder lived in other parts of the United States or in a foreign country (2.4 per cent). The percentages reported in the 1962 survey were similar, with a slightly lower percentage spending their pre-college years in Florida.

After college, 43.9 per cent of the respondents spent most of their years in Florida, with another 17.1 per cent living most of their post-college life in other southeastern states. Of the remainder, 8.9 per cent spent the major part of their adult life in the northeastern states, 8.9 per cent in the north central states, 2.1 per cent in a foreign country, and 13.5 per cent in other parts of the United States. Many of the 5.5 per cent who did not answer this question were retired military personnel, who have lived in many areas for short periods and thus unable to pin-point a particular area. In the 1962 survey, 36 per cent of the participants indicated they spent most of their post-college years in Florida, while another 23 per cent lived longest in other southeastern states.

In response to the question concerning the population of the town in which faculty members spent the major part of their youth, 50.7 per cent reported they lived in towns or communities with a population of 10,000 or less. The pattern changes somewhat after respondents completed college, with only 24.6 per cent living most of their adult life in communities of 10,000 or less. The distribution reported in the 1962 survey was remarkably similar as reflected in Table 16.

TABLE 16

COMMUNITIES IN WHICH FACULTY MEMBERS HAVE RESIDED

Community Resided In	Youth (before college)		Adulthood (after college)	
	1968	1962	1968	1962
Farm	11.1	11.0	1.1	2.3
2,500 or less	16.0	20.0	5.4	8.0
10,000	23.6	24.0	18.1	22.0
50,000	16.7	16.0	24.8	25.0
100,000	11.4	11.0	18.6	16.0
500,000	9.2	8.0	13.3	14.0
1,000,000 or more	10.7	10.0	14.1	11.0

Fifty-six per cent of the respondents stated they attended a large high school. The percentage distribution reported was: 8.8 per cent attended a small-rural high school, 3.6 per cent attended a large-rural high school, 24 per cent attended a small school in a town, 19.2 per cent attended a large school in a town, 9.8 per cent attended a small school in a city, and 33.2 per cent attended a large school in a city. The 1962 survey showed a similar distribution.

The percentage of respondents holding degrees at various levels varied slightly when the several questions concerning college degrees were tabulated. This is due, in part, to different percentages of the faculty answering the questions. Approximately 97.6 per cent reported having a bachelor's degree, 90 per cent a master's degree, and 9.2 per cent an earned doctorate. The 1962 Florida survey reported 100 per cent of its respondents had a bachelor's degree, 93 per cent a master's degree, and 13 per cent a doctorate. Medsker (24, pp. 172-73) found 6.7 per cent of his sample held no bachelor's degree, an additional 17 per cent held no master's degree, but 9.6 per cent held a doctorate.

Eckert and Stecklein (8, pp. 13-14), in their study of Minnesota junior colleges, found that 16 per cent held no master's degree, but 3.8 per cent had earned a doctorate. Lipscomb (21, pp. 29-31) concluded that approximately 96 per cent of the faculty in white Mississippi public junior colleges held the bachelor's degree, 80 to 82 per cent had earned a master's degree, and 1 to 2 per cent possessed the doctorate. Although Florida is in the fortunate position of having a higher percentage of degrees than found by other investigations cited in this study, the question arises as to why the percentage at each level has declined since 1962. The explanation is that expansion and broadening of course offerings in vocational-technical and other non-college transfer programs generated a requirement for and resulted in the hiring of competent teachers, where the premium is on experience and technical competence rather than academic degrees.

The respondents obtained their degrees from many types of institutions. At the baccalaureate level, 32.5 per cent graduated from a large public university, 22.2 per cent from a small private college, 9.8 per cent from a large public college, 9.2 per cent from a large private university, 6.4 per cent from a small teachers college, 6 per cent from a small public college, 5.7 per cent from a large private college, and 4.4 per cent from a large teachers college. The pattern changed significantly at the master's level, with 47.3 per cent earning their degrees from large public universities, and another 13.4 per cent from large private universities. More than half of the earned doctorates were obtained from large public universities with another 20 per cent from large private universities. The 1962 survey reported a similar percentage distribution as to the types of colleges from which degrees were earned. It was noted that the percentage of respondents obtaining master's and doctor's degrees from small private colleges and small public colleges increased slightly. This could possibly be a reflection of the increasing number of colleges offering graduate work.

With respect to the geographical area in which respondents attended college and received degrees, the survey data showed that 29.1 per cent earned bachelor's degrees in Florida colleges and universities. Another 18.2 per cent obtained their bachelor's degrees in other southeastern states, 16.2 per cent in north central states, 12 per cent in the northeastern states, and 19.7 per cent in other regions of the United States. At the master's degree level, 31.2 per cent of the participants indicated they obtained their degrees in Florida, 15.5 per cent in other southeastern states, 13.3 per cent in the north central states, 10.1 per cent in the northeastern states, and 17.1 per cent from other areas. Over one-third of those reporting doctor's degrees earned them in Florida. Other regions contributing more than 10 per cent of the doctor's degrees included: north central states, southeastern states other than Florida, and northeastern states. The percentage distribution of degrees by geographical area, as reported in the 1962 survey, were similar. A slight trend was noted toward a higher percentage of bachelor's and master's degrees earned in Florida, especially among younger teachers being hired direct from graduate school.

In answer to the question on whether they attended a junior college, 18.6 per cent of the respondents replied in the affirmative, as compared with 16 per cent reported in the 1962 survey. This increase is consistent with the national trend of increasing numbers of persons attending junior college before entering a four-year institution. However, the 18.6 per cent is below that found in other studies. In Medsker's (24, p. 172) sample, 27 per cent had attended a junior college, and Lipscomb (21, p. 112) found that 52 per cent of the faculty in Mississippi white junior colleges had attended a junior college as an undergraduate. These differences are attributed to the fact that more junior colleges have been available for a longer period in areas from which the Lipscomb and Medsker samples were drawn.

In answer to the question concerning their grade point average as undergraduates: 17.1 per cent said A or A-; 64.4 per cent said B+, B, or B-; and 17.6 per cent said C+, C, or C-. In the 1962 survey the results were: 22 per cent mostly A's; 62 per cent mostly B's; and 15 per cent mostly C's. Although the faculty in 1962 reported a slightly higher undergraduate grade point average, the difference was not considered large enough to be significant.

There was no appreciable change in the percentage of faculty members who belong to social fraternities or sororities. In the current survey, 34.5 per cent indicated they were members as compared with 35 per cent in the 1962 survey.

The majority of respondents were full-time students at the time they received their degrees. In the current survey, 88.3 per cent of all respondents reported they were full-time students when they earned their bachelor's degree, 56.2 per cent when they obtained their master's degree, and 7.8 per cent when they obtained their doctorates. In the 1962 survey, 92 per cent of all respondents were full-time students when they received their bachelor's degree, 57 per cent when they obtained their master's degree, and 8 per cent when they earned their doctorates.

Less than half of those not possessing a master's degree are actively working toward the degree, a smaller percentage than was reported in the 1962 survey. Of all respondents, 18.7 per cent stated they had earned ten or more course hours in a formal doctoral program, as compared to the 24 per cent reported in the 1962 survey. Also, 60.7 per cent of respondents reported they had a master's degree but were not working toward a doctorate, as compared to 56 per cent in the 1962 survey.

Four questions were asked to determine the amount of specific professional preparation faculty members had received to prepare them for teaching in a junior college. In the current survey, 44.9 per cent reported having taken one or more formal courses specifically designed to prepare them for teaching in a junior college in contrast to teaching at some other level of education. In the 1962 survey, 63 per cent reported having taken such courses. When asked how many informal courses they had taken designed specifically to assist in teaching in a junior college, 19.5 per cent of respondents in the current survey reported having had such courses, as compared with 31 per cent in the 1962 survey. Thirty-nine per cent of the respondents indicated they had taken one or more specific courses dealing primarily in junior college curriculum and purpose, while the percentage reported in the 1962 survey was 56. The participants in the current survey stated that 36.7 per cent of their number had participated in one or more "in-service" programs where considerable attention was directed to junior college curriculum and purposes. Sixty-two per cent of the respondents in the 1962 survey had participated in such programs.

Only 11.9 per cent of the faculty reported having taken teaching methods courses designed for teaching in a junior college. The kinds of teaching methods courses taken by the faculty members together with the percentages for 1968 and 1962 are shown in Table 17.

TABLE 17

DESIGN OF TEACHING METHODS COURSES TAKEN BY FACULTY

Design of Teaching Methods Course	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
Primary school	2.7	1.0
Secondary school	53.6	61.0
Junior college	11.9	11.0
Four-year college	8.3	13.0
Industry, armed forces, or government agency	3.0	[a]
Have had no such courses	18.1	11.0

[a] This response not included in 1962 survey.

The obvious conclusion is that a substantially smaller percentage of the faculty in the Florida community junior college system have had specific training, designed to assist them in junior college teaching, than was the case in 1962. A substantial number of respondents made marginal notes on the questionnaire to the effect that they had no desire to take such courses or training. This seems to be an area which will require continuing attention, with respect to convincing some faculty members of the necessity for such training, and making provisions for providing the training itself.

Previous Educational Experience

The previous educational experience of the junior college faculty is quite varied. The responses indicated that 29.8 per cent taught one or more years in industry, for the Federal government, or while in the armed forces. The 1962 survey reported 29 per cent of the faculty had this type of experience.

The participants indicated that 60.6 per cent of their number had taught in one or more elementary or secondary schools, as compared with 70 per cent reported in the 1962 survey and 65 per cent found by Medsker (24, p. 172). Of all respondents, 30.9 per cent had taught seven or more years in elementary or secondary schools, as contrasted with 39 per cent reported in the 1962 survey. The most frequent first reasons given for changing from elementary or secondary to junior college work were: "Prefer older students"--15.6 per cent; "More independence in work"--12.3 per cent; "Higher yearly pay"--11.2 per cent; and "Advance subject content"--9.4 per cent. The same first reasons were given in the 1962 survey.

The percentage of respondents who taught in one or more four-year colleges or universities decreased from 44 per cent in 1962 to 33.8 per cent in 1968. Only 8.8 per cent of the participants taught in four-year colleges or universities for seven years or more, as compared to 12.6 per cent in 1962. In addition to "other," the most frequent first reasons given for transferring from four-year college to junior college work were: "Higher yearly pay," "Less emphasis on research," and "Prefer general education."

With respect to junior college experience, 80.1 per cent of the respondents reported they had taught in one junior college, 13.8 per cent in two, and 4 per cent in three or more. The percentage distribution reported in the 1962 survey was similar. The Florida community junior college faculty is still relatively young in terms of number of years taught in a junior college. Fifty-seven per cent have taught in a junior college three years or less, as compared to 65 per cent in 1962. Table 18 shows the distribution of years taught in a junior college.

Sixty-four per cent of the participants said they had been employed in their present junior college three years or less, with 13.3 per cent having worked less than one year. When asked in what other region they had taught in a junior college, 88.9 per cent of the respondents indicated none except Florida. The 1962 survey reported 85 per cent had taught in no other region except Florida.

One of the reasons for decrease in the percentage of junior college faculty, with experience in four-year institutions and elementary and secondary schools, is the increased numbers of faculty members being hired direct from graduate schools and among armed forces retirees.

TABLE 18

YEARS TAUGHT IN JUNIOR COLLEGE

Number of Years	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
1 or less	24.4	33.0
2	16.2	22.0
3	16.4	10.0
4	8.8	11.0
5	7.5	8.0
6	4.9	4.0
7	4.8	2.0
8 or more	15.6	11.0

The principal methods used by faculty members to obtain their present positions varied considerably; however, more than half were employed through initiative of the faculty member by letter or personal visit to the school. The comparative percentages for 1968 and 1962 are set forth in Table 19.

Since being employed in their present position, 80.8 per cent of the faculty have not attempted to locate another position. Others have attempted to locate another position for a variety of reasons: 4.9 per cent for higher pay, 2.2 per cent for a more desirable school, 1.9 per cent for a more desirable community, 2 per cent for different level of education, 1.1 per cent for a different type of duty in a junior college, .3 per cent because of a desire to leave education and 3 per cent for other reasons. The percentage distribution of reasons stated in the 1962 survey formed a similar pattern, with differences too small to suggest any type of trend or change.

General Working Conditions

Most faculty members seemed to be well satisfied with teaching and junior college work as a career. This satisfaction is demonstrated by responses set forth in Table 20.

TABLE 19

PRINCIPAL METHOD BY WHICH PRESENT POSITION WAS OBTAINED

Method	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
Sought out by president or dean	16.2	18.0
Recommended by fellow teacher	9.7	8.0
Recommended by graduate professor	3.5	4.4
Placement procedure of graduate school	4.4	3.3
Your initiative by letter	25.4	28.0
Your initiative by personal visit to school	25.5	23.0
You were in some other school in the same junior college area	7.5	9.0
Commercial placement agency	1.4	2.6
Other	5.0	4.0

TABLE 20

SATISFACTION WITH TEACHING AND JUNIOR COLLEGE WORK AS A CAREER

Degree of Satisfaction	Per Cent			
	Teaching as a Career		Junior College Work as a Career	
	1968	1962	1968	1962
Very satisfied	57.9	59.0	50.1	46.0
Satisfied	37.1	37.0	43.5	44.0
Indifferent	2.2	1.3	3.1	4.5
Dissatisfied	1.0	1.8	2.6	4.0
Very dissatisfied	.5	.1	.5	.5

Asked if they planned to stay in junior college work until retirement from full-time employment, 58.5 per cent of the respondents answered yes, 11.6 per cent answered no, and 29.6 per cent said they did not know. The corresponding percentages reported in the 1962 survey were 55, 11, and 34, respectively. The relatively small size of the junior college, as compared to the university, had appeal to 55.5 per cent of the faculty as a good place to teach; 7.8 per cent indicated small size did not appeal to them; and 34.5 per cent said size was not important to them.

The participants were asked to select, from a group of responses, their main satisfactions and dissatisfactions with the nature of junior college work. The satisfactions most often selected were: "Enjoyment of teaching"--35.5 per cent; "Helping young people grow"--27.6 per cent; "Association with college age students"--15.1 per cent; and "Transmitting knowledge"--12.2 per cent. The same reasons were selected in the same order, but with slightly different percentages, during the 1962 survey. The main dissatisfactions with the nature of junior college work were: "Need to transmit elementary knowledge"--14 per cent; "Other"--13.9 per cent; and "Lack of time for research"--13 per cent. The same dissatisfactions were named in the 1962 survey. A surprisingly large 42.6 per cent reported they had no dissatisfactions with the nature of junior college work.

With respect to the main satisfactions with working conditions in a junior college, the most frequent responses were: "Freedom and independence in work"--37.8 per cent; "Fine colleagues"--18.5 per cent; "Desirable environment"--18 per cent; and "Intellectually stimulating associations"--11.7 per cent. The same four reasons were selected by highest percentage of respondents during the 1962 survey. The main dissatisfactions with working conditions in a junior college were: "Poorly motivated students"--25.3 per cent; "Other"--12.8 per cent; "Excessive classroom hours"--10.9 per cent; and "Lack of time for class preparation"--8.2 per cent. The same choices were made in the 1962 survey. It was noted that 29.7 per cent reported they had no dissatisfactions with working conditions in the junior college.

When asked to identify their main satisfactions with the appreciations and rewards of junior college teaching the participants selected: "Personal satisfactions"--42.5 per cent; "Sense of social usefulness"--30.9 per cent; and "Pay"--13.3 per cent. The same reasons were selected in the 1962 survey. To the general request for their main dissatisfactions with junior college work, the participants chose: "None"--29 per cent; "Administrative procedures"--25 per cent; "Pay"--10.2 per cent; "Working hours"--8.4 per cent; and "Student load"--8.4 per cent. The same choices were selected by respondents in the 1962 survey. Garrison identified similar items as main concerns of junior college faculty members; namely, lack of time for preparation and innovation caused by workload, and failure of the administration to understand faculty problems and make provisions for faculty participation in decision- and policy-making (9).

Table 21 shows first choice selection of factors by the participants as having the most overall benefit to junior college work, with corresponding percentages for the current and 1962 surveys.

The Florida community junior college faculty is a hard-working group. The survey found that 64.5 per cent devote 45 or more hours per week to work for their junior college. A breakdown of 64.5 per cent working 45 or more hours per week is divided as follows: 17.8 per cent work 55 or more hours per week, 17.1 per cent work 50 hours per week, 11.3 per cent work 48 hours per week, and 18.3 per cent work 45 hours per week. The 1962 survey reported that 78 per cent of the faculty worked 45 or more hours per week.

If salary, promotion, and security were equal, 54.2 per cent of the respondents said they preferred to teach in a junior college; 34.8 per cent preferred teaching in a four-year college or university, 1.1 per cent preferred teaching in a high school, and 9.4 per cent had no strong preference. The percentages reported in the 1962 survey were almost identical. In Medsker's (24, p. 175) sample responses to the same question indicated only 41 per cent preferred to teach in a junior college.

Respondents were asked what type of career they would choose if they had their lives to live over again. The replies indicated that 49.7 per cent would teach in a junior college, 29.6 per cent would teach in a university, 1.2 per cent would teach in a secondary school, 1 per cent would teach in a primary school, and 14.8 per cent would choose a career outside of education. Percentages reported in the 1962 survey had a similar distribution.

Attitude toward faculty rank for all Florida community junior colleges changed somewhat from 1962 to 1968, with 49.5 per cent now favoring faculty rank as compared with 39 per cent in 1962. Table 22 illustrates this change in attitude.

Another change in attitude was apparent with reference to nomenclature preferred by the faculty in the name of their institutions. Almost half still prefer the name "Junior College," but the percentage preferring "Community Junior College" increased from 13 per cent in 1962 to 19.6 per cent in 1968. Also the percentage preferring "college" decreased from 22 per cent in 1962 to 8.4 per cent in 1968. This may indicate a trand toward faculty recognition of their junior college as a unique community oriented institution rather than a junior version of a four-year college or university. Table 23 depicts these changes in attitude.

TABLE 21

FACTORS HAVING MOST OVERALL BENEFIT TO JUNIOR COLLEGE WORK

Factor	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
Higher pay	31.0	52.0
More prestige for teachers	9.4	8.0
Better facilities (bulding, etc.)	12.5	9.0
More restrictive admission policies	7.9	9.0
Lighter teaching load	17.9	8.0
Paid time for research	4.2	2.6
More clerical help	5.4	3.4
Better security (tenure, retirement, etc.)	3.5	2.9
Other	5.3	3.4

TABLE 22

ATTITUDE TOWARD FACULTY RANK

Attitude	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
Strongly favor it	18.7	15.0
Favor it	30.8	24.0
Neither for nor against it	25.3	36.0
Against it	13.4	15.0
Strongly against it	8.1	8.0
Not familiar with it	3.3	1.5

TABLE 23

ATTITUDE ON NAME PREFERRED FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES

Name	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
Junior College	48.9	44.0
Community Junior College	19.6	13.0
Community College	20.8	21.0
College	8.4	22.0
Other	1.8	

The faculty expressed a more favorable attitude toward the principle of merit pay than in 1962, with 51.4 per cent favoring or strongly favoring it as compared to 42 per cent in 1962.

In response to a question concerning who has the most powerful voice in determining the educational program of their colleges, 34.2 per cent of the participants said the college president. Another 21.1 per cent stated that power was too widely spread to attribute to a single source; 11.5 per cent thought that department heads were most powerful in this area; and 10.5 chose the deans as most influential in determining educational program of the college. Although the percentages were different, the faculty made the same choices in the same order in 1962.

Attitude Toward Functions of the Community Junior College

The information in this section is based on responses to thirty-two questions concerning the importance that should be accorded selected functions of the community colleges in Florida. These questions were designed to determine degree of acceptance by the faculty of the comprehensive nature of Florida community junior colleges. The respondents were asked to indicate where emphasis should be placed from a group of alternatives related to the transfer, terminal, and community service programs. Although 60.5 per cent of the faculty believed equal emphasis should be placed on all three programs, a substantial number do not accept the community service function as having the same importance as the transfer and terminal functions. Table 24 shows the percentage of respondents who selected the various alternatives.

TABLE 24

PROGRAM EMPHASIS IN JUNIOR COLLEGE

Function	Per Cent	
	1968	1962
Primarily transfer function	8.0	15.0
Primarily terminal function	2.0	1.5
Primarily community service	2.5	3.1
About equally on transfer and terminal functional	21.2	18.0
About equally on transfer and community service	3.9	3.6
About equally on terminal and community service	.6	.8
About equally on transfer, terminal, and community service	60.5	57.0

A list of specific functions, programs, and activities frequently associated with comprehensive junior colleges was presented to the respondents with a request that they indicate the importance of each as a function of a Florida community junior college. Answers of "Very important function of a junior college" and "Important function of a junior college" were scored as denoting acceptance, while the answers of "Of little importance as a junior college function" and "Should not be a function of a junior college" were scored as denoting rejection. Table 25 is a listing of the specific functions, together with the percentages of faculty members who accepted and rejected each function in the current survey and 1962 survey.

Over 90 per cent of the faculty accepted the college transfer program, the terminal program, and evening courses as important functions of a Florida community junior college. Functions receiving less than 90 per cent acceptance were adult non-credit courses--79.6 per cent, general education courses--87.4 per cent, adult personal enrichment courses--76.1 per cent, concerts and plays--77 per cent, adult vocational courses--62.5 per cent, public forums--60.4 per cent, elderly citizens courses--49.7 per cent, and high school completion courses--29.6 per cent. Guided or developmental studies in English, mathematics, study skills, and reading were accepted by 89 per cent or more of the faculty, and showed a significant increase in acceptance from 1962 to 1968.

TABLE 25

DEGREE OF ACCEPTANCE OF SELECTED JUNIOR COLLEGE FUNCTIONS

Function	Per Cent			
	1968		1962	
	Accepted	Rejected	Accepted	Rejected
Guided or developmental studies in English (written)	91.6	7.2	79.0	21.0
Guided or developmental studies in mathematics	89.8	8.6	77.0	22.0
Guided or developmental studies in study skills	89.0	9.7	75.0	25.0
Guided or developmental studies in reading	91.0	7.6	80.0	19.0
Transfer (college parallel) program	95.5	3.3	97.0	2.7
Terminal program	93.0	5.6	94.0	5.6
Adult non-credit courses	79.6	19.3	76.0	24.0
Evening courses of all types	91.3	7.7	90.0	9.0
High school completion courses	29.6	69.3	21.0	79.0
Adult vocational courses	62.5	36.4	52.0	48.0
Elderly citizens courses	49.7	49.2	50.0	48.0
General education courses	87.4	11.4	92.0	7.3
Public forums	60.4	38.2	68.0	31.0
Concerts, plays, etc.	77.0	22.0	86.0	14.3
Adult personal enrichment courses, e.g., art, music, literature	76.1	23.0	82.0	18.0
Counseling on personal problems	74.4	24.7	68.0	31.0
Career selection counseling	89.8	9.3	89.0	11.0
Student government	75.0	24.0	82.0	17.0

TABLE 25 (continued)

Function	Per Cent			
	1968		1962	
	Accepted	Rejected	Accepted	Rejected
Student interest clubs and honorary societies	73.2	25.9	82.0	18.0
Student recreation	68.8	30.0	76.0	23.5
Personal relationships between faculty and student	86.3	12.6	88.0	11.0
Athletics (intercollegiate and/or intramural)	67.3	31.5	70.0	30.0
Provide financial assistance to students	87.9	11.3	86.0	13.0
Preparation for marriage and family life	69.7	29.5	73.0	27.0
Developing good health habits	67.9	31.1	76.0	23.0
Developing social competence	75.0	23.9	80.0	19.0
Developing civic responsibility	85.8	13.3	91.0	8.4
Data gathering on students and its use by the faculty	69.4	29.2	74.0	26.0
Short courses for business and industry	79.2	19.8	77.0	22.0
Open admission policy to all courses	51.8	46.6	40.0	47.0
Restricted admission policy to college transfer courses	62.0	35.6	59.0	27.0

The functions related to guidance and student activities were accepted by 65 per cent or more of the faculty; however, many of these functions were rejected by more than 25 per cent of the respondents. Career selection counseling, personal relationships between faculty and student, providing financial assistance to students, and developing social responsibility were considered important functions by more than 85 per cent of the faculty. Student recreation, athletics, preparation for marriage and family life, developing good health habits, and data gathering on students and its use by the faculty were accepted as important functions by less than 70 per cent of the respondents. There were some variations in degree of acceptance between the current and 1962 surveys, but these were not considered particularly significant.

Only 51.8 per cent of the faculty accepted "Open admission policy to all courses" and 62 per cent accepted "Restricted admission policy to college transfer courses."

Attitude Toward Guidance and Counseling

Counseling, guidance, and related student services functions are an integral part of any comprehensive junior college program. In the previous section, several questions concerning the degree of importance accorded some of these functions by the faculty were discussed. In this section responses to several additional questions related to counseling and guidance functions will be considered.

Either full-time or part-time work in counseling was reported by 6.1 per cent of the respondents, with 4.9 per cent doing most of their work in the counseling area. Of all faculty members reporting, 71.3 per cent were advising students on academic problems, with 52.1 per cent advising ten or more. Counseling of students on "other than academic problems" was being performed by 56.1 per cent of the faculty, with 23.4 per cent advising ten or more students. A slightly greater percentage of faculty members were performing these functions in 1962.

Over 70 per cent of the faculty reported that classroom teachers devote 20 per cent or less of their time, after the first week of school, to academic advising concerned with course work, and 68.1 per cent felt this was the right amount of time to spend on this function. Over 55 per cent of the faculty reported that the classroom teacher spends 10 per cent or less of his time, after the first week of school, on personal counseling, other than academic course work. Fifty per cent of the faculty thought 10 per cent or less was the proper amount of time for the classroom teacher to spend on personal counseling. It should be noted that 20.4 per cent of all respondents felt that the classroom teacher should spend no time on personal counseling. The percentages on these questions were similar in the 1962 survey.

When asked what should junior colleges rely primarily on professional counselors for, 34 per cent of the faculty said personal problems other than class work, 9.2 per cent said academic advising (course selection, academic progress, etc.), 46.7 per cent said both academic and personal problems, and 7.8 per cent thought both types of problems are better handled by classroom teachers. In response to a question on when the orientation of new students should be given, 13 per cent selected the late high school period, 30.3 per cent said before enrollment, 22.6 per cent preferred the first week of school, 23.9 per cent said throughout the first semester, and 8.8 per cent voiced the opinion that orientation is not effective enough to matter when it is done. Similar percentage patterns on these two questions were reported in the 1962 survey.

Fifty-eight per cent of the respondents disagreed with the statement "junior colleges devoted too much time and effort to counseling on personal or life adjustment problems." Eighty-two per cent disagreed with the statement, "in junior colleges which accept most all applicants, there is no reason for extensive testing of new students."

Forty-nine per cent of the respondents agreed and 41.7 per cent disagreed with the position that faculty members should expect to participate as advisors, chaperones, etc., in student extracurricular activities. When asked whether they desired to participate as an advisor, chaperone, etc., in student extracurricular activities, 9.7 per cent of the faculty said "Very much," 46.1 per cent said, "Some," 26.1 per cent said "Very little," and 17.4 per cent said "Not at all."

In answer to questions concerning whether or not the junior college should actively stimulate student participation in clubs and recreation, 31.9 per cent said "Extensively" to clubs and 25.8 per cent said "Extensively" to recreation. "When convenient" was the choice selected by 40.7 per cent for clubs and 40.3 per cent for recreation. "Limited amount" was reported by 23.9 per cent for clubs and 23.7 per cent for recreation.

A series of questions concerning the relative importance of advising, counseling, and academic instruction were asked. Counseling of all types was considered equally as important as academic instruction by 57.9 per cent of the faculty, while 32.8 per cent considered counseling less important. Academic advising on course selection and progress in course work was thought to be equally as important as academic instruction by 60.8 per cent of the respondents, while 30.4 per cent thought academic advising was less important. Counseling on personal problems and academic instruction were considered equally important by 48.7 per cent of the faculty, while 40 per cent considered counseling on personal problems less important. When asked whether counseling on personal problems is more important in a junior college than in a four-year college, 30.6 per cent said "More important," 54.6 per cent said "Equally important," and only 3.6 per cent said "Less important."

The 1962 survey contained no response patterns considered different enough to draw inferences concerning changes or trands in faculty attitudes on counseling and guidance.

Degree of Satisfaction with Own Junior College

The information reported in this section is based on responses to questions designed to determine the degree of faculty satisfaction with selected activities, programs, and features of their own junior college. Physical facilities, operating procedures, policies and regulations, organization and administration, instructional practices, academic and student services, faculty qualifications and duties, guidance and counseling, and other selected items were included.

Faculty members were asked to compare the overall educational standards achieved by their own college with their concept of a good public junior college in terms of several factors. In response to the first question, 91.4 per cent considered qualifications of their faculty good or very good as compared to their concept of a good junior college. With respect to quality of their students: 11.1 per cent considered them very good, 33.2 per cent considered them good, 49.5 per cent considered them average, and 6.3 per cent considered them poor or very poor. On quality of teaching in their junior college: 46.5 per cent of the faculty rated it very good, 41.4 per cent as good, 11.5 per cent as average, and .7 per cent as poor. The quality of administration in their junior college was considered very good by 35.3 per cent of the faculty, good by 34.8 per cent, average by 19.8 per cent, poor by 7.2 per cent, and very poor by 3 per cent. The quality of student government in their own college was reported as very good by 9.4 per cent of the faculty, good by 27.7 per cent, average by 45.9 per cent, poor by 13.9 per cent, and very poor by 3.1 per cent. The 1962 survey gave a lower rating than the current survey to faculty qualifications, quality of students, and quality of teaching, and a higher rating to quality of administration and quality of student government.

The question on state of morale among the faculty members' immediate co-workers elicited these responses: "Very good" from 33.4 per cent of the respondents, "Good" from 35.3 per cent, "Average" from 20.6 per cent, "Poor" from 7.8 per cent, and "Very poor" by 3 per cent. The 1962 survey reported faculty morale slightly higher than the current survey.

The flow of significant information, views, and opinions between the faculty and administration was considered entirely adequate by 17.5 per cent of the faculty, fairly adequate by 52.8 per cent, inadequate by 22.3 per cent, and completely inadequate by 7.5 per cent. The flow of significant information, views, and opinions between faculty members in different areas of their schools was reported as: entirely adequate by 9.7 per cent of the respondents, fairly adequate by 48.5 per cent, inadequate by 35.6 per cent, and completely inadequate by 6.3 per cent. The 1962 survey reported a much better flow of information than the current survey.

Four questions were asked about faculty influence and participation in different areas. With respect to faculty influence in selection of new faculty members: 59.5 per cent reported it was about right, 38.8 per cent said it was too little, and only 1.8 per cent considered it too much. Faculty influence and participation in assignments of class schedules was considered about right by 66.5 per cent of those responding, too little by

31.8 per cent, and too much by 1.8 per cent. Faculty participation in student disciplinary matters was considered about right by 75.0 per cent of the faculty, too little by 23.1 per cent, and too much by 1.9 per cent. Faculty participation in the design of new buildings was reported as about right by 49.5 per cent of the respondents, too little by 49.3 per cent, and too much by 1.3 per cent. The 1962 survey reported a significantly higher percentage of "about right" responses to these four questions.

A listing of 46 items concerning activities, programs, and features of a junior college was presented to the respondents for an expression of their degree of satisfaction on each item. Responses were indicated by circling numbers representing the following categories: (1) Entirely satisfied, (2) Reasonably satisfied, (3) Mixed feelings, (4) Somewhat dissatisfied, and (5) Completely dissatisfied. For reporting purposes, the first two categories have been combined to give a total percentage indicating satisfaction. Categories four and five have been combined to indicate a percentage showing dissatisfaction. Table 26 provides a listing of the questions together with the percentages satisfied and dissatisfied with each. For purposes of comparison, the table also shows the percentages of satisfied and dissatisfied respondents to the 1962 survey. It should be noted that the 1962 survey offered a sixth response to these questions entitled "No opinion." This should be kept in mind when comparing percentages of satisfaction and dissatisfaction between the two surveys.

TABLE 26

FACULTY SATISFACTION WITH SELECTED FUNCTIONS AND FEATURES OF OWN JUNIOR COLLEGE

Function or Feature	Per Cent			
	1968		1962	
	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Admission policy	70.2	11.3	56.0	12.0
Pre-admission counseling	52.6	21.5	44.0	29.0
Registration procedures	49.9	28.1	56.0	23.0
Classroom facilities	67.1	18.4	57.0	31.0
Parking facilities	64.6	24.9	59.0	30.0
Eating facilities	41.7	42.5	43.0	38.0
Physical education facilities	63.0	21.2	46.0	25.0
General education program	80.8	4.1	73.0	7.4

TABLE 26 (continued)

Function or Feature	Per Cent			
	1968		1962	
	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Student counseling services	59.5	14.8	49.0	22.0
Purchasing policies	46.8	25.3	40.0	30.0
Services offered in guided or developmental studies	65.2	8.5	40.0	21.0
Quality of students attracted to your school	57.0	13.8	40.3	28.0
Number of students in classrooms	60.1	22.7	75.0	11.6
Student-teacher ratio	60.2	22.5	77.0	10.0
Length of class period	85.7	5.2	90.0	3.1
Faculty office facilities	60.4	26.8	48.0	36.0
Library materials (books and periodicals)	78.8	10.2	63.0	18.0
Audio-visual materials	75.8	9.2	55.0	17.0
Expendable supplies	73.1	11.4	67.0	12.0
Number and size of student scholarships	57.5	14.9	46.0	18.0
Number and nature of personnel policies	54.5	16.6	49.0	12.0
Clerical assistance	54.3	25.6	47.0	36.0
Procedures for obtaining new library materials	78.3	7.3	67.0	11.5
Effectiveness in obtaining new library materials	75.0	8.8	63.0	13.0
School catalog	74.0	10.1	70.0	10.0
Library reading area	77.3	10.8	54.0	26.0
Student lounge or center	53.6	29.0	23.0	48.0

TABLE 26 (continued)

Function or Feature	Per Cent			
	1968		1962	
	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Auditorium facilities	48.4	37.9	22.0	56.0
Reserve book procedures in library	82.5	4.7	75.0	6.1
Library hours	84.3	6.1	78.0	9.0
Responsiveness of librarians to faculty and student needs	89.1	3.7	82.0	4.5
Student social program in general	53.4	10.3	40.0	19.0
Regulation on student dress	53.8	21.7	59.0	16.0
School newspaper	57.2	18.9	63.0	12.6
Present grading practices (A, B, C, D, etc.)	70.4	11.3	77.0	7.3
Teaching load	61.1	20.1	65.0	16.0
Student contact hours	64.8	15.9	66.0	14.0
Provisions for professional and sabbatical leave	56.2	24.4	67.0	28.0
Faculty participation in curriculum development	58.5	19.7	*	
Faculty in-service training programs	40.9	26.9	*	
College organization and administrative procedures	52.7	22.6		
Effectiveness of the faculty handbook	57.1	16.9	*	
Time available for professional study and preparation for classes	51.9	25.4	*	

TABLE 26 (continued)

Function or Feature	Per Cent			
	1968		1962	
	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Faculty participation in institutional policy-formulation and decision-making	41.9	31.2	*	
Effectiveness of faculty meetings	37.3	32.6	*	
Orientation procedures for new faculty members	59.6	18.6	*	

*These questions were not included in the 1962 survey

Satisfaction with admission policy was indicated by 70.2 per cent of the faculty, while 11.3 per cent expressed dissatisfaction. Fifty-seven per cent was satisfied with the quality of students attracted to their school, with 13.8 per cent reporting dissatisfaction. The degree of satisfaction on these two items had increased significantly since 1962. The faculty were considerably less satisfied with registration procedures than in 1962, with 49.9 per cent expressing satisfaction and 28.1 per cent dissatisfaction.

With respect to physical facilities, it should be noted many of the newer colleges are in temporary quarters which are substandard. Except for eating facilities, the faculty was more satisfied with their colleges' physical facilities than in 1962; however, a substantial percentage of respondents were still dissatisfied with these facilities. For example, 26.8 per cent were dissatisfied with faculty office facilities, 24.9 per cent with parking facilities, 42.5 per cent with eating facilities, 21.2 per cent with physical education facilities, 29 per cent with student lounges or centers, and 37.9 per cent with auditorium facilities. The 42.5 per cent dissatisfaction with eating facilities was the highest expressed among questions listed in Table 26.

Considerable dissatisfaction was reported on activities related to student services, but not as much as on physical facilities. Except for student newspaper and regulations on student dress, there was a percentage increase in satisfaction since 1962 on these items. Satisfaction was expressed with pre-admission counseling by 52.6 per cent of the faculty, with student counseling services by 59.5 per cent, with services offered in guided or developmental studies by 65.2 per cent, with the student social program in general by 53.4 per cent, with regulations on student dress by 53.8 per cent, with the school newspaper by 57.2 per cent, with the number and size of student scholarships by 57.5 per cent, and with the school catalog by 74 per cent. Dissatisfaction with these items ranged from 10 to 21 per cent.

On six items related to their teaching situation, the percentage of satisfied respondents was lower than in 1962. The responses indicated that: 60.1 per cent were satisfied and 22.7 per cent dissatisfied with number of students in the classroom; 60.2 per cent satisfied and 22.5 per cent dissatisfied with student-teacher ratio; 85.7 per cent satisfied and 5.2 per cent dissatisfied with length of class period; 70.4 per cent satisfied and 11.3 per cent dissatisfied with present grading practices; 61.1 per cent satisfied and 20.1 per cent dissatisfied with their teaching load; and 64.8 per cent satisfied and 15.9 per cent dissatisfied with student contact hours.

Over 75 per cent of the respondents reported satisfaction with the eight questions concerning library services. Since 1962 there has been a significant increase in the percentage of faculty members satisfied with each of the eight items. The percentages of faculty members expressing satisfaction with each library service item were: 75.8 per cent with library materials, 75.8 per cent with audio-visual materials, 78.3 per cent with procedures for obtaining new library materials, 75 per cent with effectiveness in obtaining new library materials, 77.3 per cent with library reading area, 82.5 per cent with reserve books in the library, 84.3 per cent with library hours, and 89.1 per cent with responsiveness of librarians to faculty and student needs.

Purchasing policies were satisfactory to 46.8 per cent of the faculty and unsatisfactory to 25.3 per cent. Personnel policies were considered satisfactory by 54.5 per cent of the respondents, while 16.6 per cent reported they were dissatisfied with them. The percentage of faculty members expressing satisfaction with these policies was slightly higher than in 1962.

Eight questions concerning faculty development and participation, not included in this section of the 1962 survey, were presented to respondents for their reaction. Fifty-seven per cent of the respondents reported they were satisfied with the effectiveness of the faculty handbook, 58.5 per cent with faculty participation in curriculum development, 52.7 per cent with college organization and administrative procedures, and 59.6 per cent with orientation procedures for new faculty members. More than 25 per cent of faculty expressed dissatisfaction with faculty in-service training programs, time available for professional study and preparation for classes, effectiveness of faculty meetings, and faculty participation in institutional policy-formulation and decision-making. The responses to these eight questions are considered significant, since they give the college administrator some clues on how he might increase faculty satisfaction and effectiveness without expending a gread deal of additional resources.

The "Typical" Faculty Member

In analyzing the data presented in this chapter concerning the full-time Florida community junior college faculty member's background, education, experience, attitudes and opinions, some interesting characteristics were noted. The "typical" faculty member fits the following pattern:

1. Male teacher, about 41 years of age, making about $9,250 for ten months of teaching.

2. He has a master's degree, earned from a large private or public university in Florida or the southeast.

3. He owns or is buying his home, is married to a spouse with some college education, and has two children.

4. He has taught for three years or less in a junior college, and has previous teaching experience in a four-year college or secondary or elementary school.

5. He was born and lived most of his youth before college east of the Mississippi River in a community of 10,000 or less.

6. He spent most of his adult life after college in Florida or the southeast in a community of 10,000 or more.

7. His family is well satisfied with the community in which they live, he attends church fairly often, he belongs to one or more educational or professional organizations, but does not belong to a civic organization.

8. He is well satisfied with junior college work and with teaching as a career. He prefers teaching in a junior college to teaching in a four-year college or secondary school, and plans to continue working in a junior college until retirement.

9. He spends 45 or more hours each week on his junior college work, advises ten or more students on academic problems, and sometimes serves as advisor or chaperone to student extracurricular activities.

10. He obtained his present position through his own initiative by letter or personal visit, and has not looked for another job since accepting his present position.

11. He likes junior college work because he enjoys teaching, helping young people grow, and associating with college age students.

12. He is fairly satisfied with working conditions in his junior college, considers morale of his colleagues good, and believes that teaching done at his college is very good.

13. In general, he believes the community junior college should place equal emphasis on the transfer, terminal, and community service functions, but he is inclined to question the importance of some aspects of the community service program.

14. He would like to see further improvements in physical facilities, a lighter teaching load, better administration, and more participation in college decisions which affect him and his work.

Faculty Trends--1962 to 1968

The comparisons made in this chapter between the 1962 and 1968 surveys of the Florida community junior college faculty resulted in the identification of several trends when viewed from the standpoint of the faculty as a whole. The reader is cautioned that the trends set forth in this section do not necessarily apply to individual institutions. Some of the trends noted were these:

1. There was a small increase in the percentage of full-time teachers and counselors and a small decrease in the percentage of administrators.

2. The average age of the faculty member increased slightly, with a small percentage increase in age groups 20-29 and 50-54.

3. There was a small increase in the percentage of male faculty members.

4. A smaller percentage of faculty members had served in the armed forces, but the percentage of retired military faculty members almost doubled.

5. There was a small increase in the percentage of married faculty members, and a small increase in the percentage of faculty members having two or more children.

6. A slightly higher percentage of faculty spouses had earned bachelor's and advanced degrees.

7. There was a large increase in teacher salaries and in salaries for non-teaching faculty.

8. A smaller percentage of faculty members participate regularly in religious and social activities of a church.

9. There was a small decrease in percentage of faculty members belonging to civic organizations, and to national, regional, and state educational organizations of a general nature; and a small increase in the percentage of faculty members belonging to professional or scholarly organizations pertaining to their subject matter areas.

10. There was a small increase in the percentage of faculty members whose families are satisfied or very satisfied with the community in which they live.

11. There was a decrease in percentage of faculty members whose fathers were unskilled or low-salaried workers.

12. A higher percentage of the faculty spent most of their youth and adulthood in Florida than was the case in 1962.

13. There was a decrease in the percentage of faculty members holding bachelor's, master's, and doctor's degrees.

14. There was a small increase in the percentage of faculty members who earned their bachelor's and master's degrees in Florida.

15. There was a slight increase in the percentage of faculty members who had attended a junior college.

16. There was smaller percentage of faculty members not possessing a master's degree who were actively working toward the degree.

17. A smaller percentage of faculty members have had specific training, designed to assist them in junior college teaching, than was the case in 1962.

18. There was a decrease in the percentage of faculty members who had teaching experience in elementary or secondary schools and in four-year colleges and universities.

19. There was a decrease in the percentage of faculty members who had taught three years or less in a junior college.

20. There was a decrease in the percentage of faculty members who placed emphasis on higher pay, and an increase in the percentage who placed emphasis on better facilities and a lighter teaching load.

21. Although the majority of faculty members devote more than 45 hours per week to their junior college responsibilities, there was significant decrease in the number of hours worked by most faculty members.

22. There was an increase in the percentage of faculty members who favored use of "community Junior College" in the name of their institution.

23. There was increase in the percentage of faculty members who favored the principle of merit pay.

24. There was a significant increase in the percentage of faculty members who accepted guided or developmental studies as an important function of a junior college.

25. There was an increase in the percentage of the faculty who gave a high rating to faculty qualifications, quality of students, and quality of teaching, and a decrease in the percentage who gave a high rating to quality of administration and quality of student government.

26. There was a decrease in the percentage of faculty members who thought that the flow of significant information between the administration and faculty and between faculty in different parts of the college was adequate.

27. There was a higher percentage of the faculty satisfied with admission policies, physical facilities (with some exceptions), student services (with some exceptions), and library services.

28. There was a decrease in the percentage of faculty members satisfied with their teaching situation (such as number of students in the classroom, student-teacher ratio, present grading practices, teaching load, and student contact hours).

29. Though not specifically measured in 1962, faculty members expressed considerable dissatisfaction with in-service training programs, orientation procedures for new faculty members, faculty participation in curriculum development, time available for professional study and preparation for classes, college organization and administrative procedures, effectiveness of faculty meetings, and faculty participation in policy-formulation and decision-making within their college.

CHAPTER III

COMPARISON OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED FACULTY GROUPS

In this chapter, a comparison was made of the personal and educational backgrounds, work experience, attitudes, and opinions of those Florida community junior college faculty members most satisfied and most dissatisfied with selected features, activities programs, policies, organization, and conditions in their own junior college. Following the procedures set forth in Chapter I, 454 faculty members (approximately one-sixth of those included in the study), who by their responses to questions 167-225 in the questionnaire (Appendix B), indicated the highest degree of satisfaction with features and conditions in their own institution, were selected for inclusion in what is referred to throughout the remainder of this study as the "satisfied group." The 444 faculty members, who by their responses to the same questions, indicated the least satisfaction with their own institution were selected for inclusion in a "dissatisfied group." The reader is cautioned to remember that the terms "satisfied group" and "dissatisfied group," as used in this study, are relative terms. They simply mean that those faculty members in the "satisfied group" received the highest cumulative scores on questions 167-225, and those in the "dissatisfied group" received the lowest cumulative scores on the same questions. The cut-off point for inclusion in each group was the first break in scores beyond 440 persons (representing one-sixth of all faculty members in the study). This procedure caused a small difference in the number included in each group. No other significance should be attached to the different number of subjects in the two groups.

In many cases there were no appreciable differences in answers to questions by the two groups. In such cases, discussion of the question was omitted or abbreviated unless the lack of difference in itself was considered significant.

Personal Background

Table 27 contains the data in percentages on questions concerning personal background of the respondents on which the two groups varied most. The most important differences noted in the age ranges of the two groups were: 23.4 per cent of the satisfied group were under 35 years of age, as compared to 40.5 per cent of the dissatisfied group; and 34.8 per cent of the satisfied group were 50 years of age or older, as compared to 18 per cent for the dissatisfied group. Seventy-one per cent of the dissatisfied group were male, as compared to 66.7 per cent of the satisfied group. Differences in marital status were not pronounced, with

24.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 27.8 per cent of the dissatisfied having no spouse. The satisfied group contained a higher percentage (11.7%) of retired milirary personnel than did the dissatisfied group (8.1%). The size of family did not vary to any appreciable degree.

TABLE 27

PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED GROUPS ON QUESTIONS RELATING TO PERSONAL BACKGROUND

Personal Data	Per Cent Satisfied Group	Per Cent Dissatisfied Group
Under 35 years of age	23.4	40.5
50 years of age or older	34.8	18.0
Male	66.7	71.0
Female	31.7	27.3
Not married	24.5	27.8
Retired from armed forces	11.7	8.1
Father's occupation:		
Business owner or executive	27.8	31.3
Farm owner or renter	14.1	6.5
Spent youth on farm or town of 2,500 or less	32.2	18.7
Spent adulthood in city of 100.000 or more	40.8	59.9
Organization membership:		
Belong to three or more professional organizations	42.3	55.6
Belong to one or more civic groups	51.0	41.2
Belong to one or more educational groups	84.3	75.3
Participated often in religious activities	64.7	43.5
Family satisfaction with community:		
Satisfied or very satisfied	94.0	75.4
Dissatisfied or very dissatisfied	2.2	14.3

The satisfied group reported 32.2 per cent of their number spent their youth (before college) on a farm or a town of 2,500 or less, while this was true for only 18.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Also significant is that 40.8 per cent of the satisfied group and 59.9 per cent of the dissatisfied group lived most of their adult (after college) life in a city of 100,000 or more. There were no significant variations as to education level attained by parents of those in each group, nor in the geographical area in which respondents spent their youth and adulthood.

Occupations followed by fathers of the faculty members were fairly evenly distrubuted between the two groups, however, fathers of a higher percentage (31.3%) of the dissatisfied group were business owners or executives than were fathers of the satisfied group (27.8%). On the other hand, 14.1 per cent of faculty members in the satisfied group had fathers who were farm owners or renters, while only 6.5 per cent of the dissatisfied had fathers with this occupation. Sixty-one per cent of the dissatisfied group had mothers who did not work regularly, while 64.8 per cent of the satisfied group had mothers who did not work regularly.

There was no appreciable difference in the percentage of each group belonging to professional or scholarly organizations related to their subject matter areas; however, 55.6 per cent of the dissatisfied group belonged to three or more such organizations, as compared to 42.3 per cent of the satisfied group. On the other hand, 51 per cent of the satisfied group belonged to one or more civic groups, as opposed to 41.2 per cent of the satisfied group. Over 84 per cent of the satisfied group belonged to one or more educational organizations of a general nature, while 75.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group belonged to such organizations. More members of the satisfied group (49.5%) thought organizations such as NEA, FEA, AFT, etc., exercised extensive or moderate influence in achieving member goals, than did members of the dissatisfied group (31.1%). As to religious activities, 64.7 per cent of the satisfied group reported they attended church regularly or often, while 43.5 per cent of the dissatisfied group reported attending regularly or often.

Asked about their family satisfaction with the community in which they live, 70 per cent of the satisfied group and 33.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group reported they were very satisfied. Another 24 per cent of the satisfied group and 42.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group reported they were satisfied. Only 2.2 per cent of the satisfied group reported they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their present community.

Educational Preparation

As shown in Table 28, a rural high school was attended by 14.1 per cent of the satisfied group and 9.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Attending junior college seemed to have no effect on faculty satisfaction, since the percentages of both groups attending and not attending junior college were almost identical. There was no appreciable

TABLE 28

PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED GROUPS ON QUESTIONS RELATING TO EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

Type of Preparation	Per Cent Satisfied Group	Per Cent Dissatisfied Group
Attended rural high school	14.1	9.4
Earned bachelor's degree in Florida	23.4	29.3
Earned master's degree in Florida	25.1	30.4
No bachelor's degree	5.0	2.0
No master's degree	14.0	9.0
Earned master's degree as full-time student	49.1	60.8
Education experience:		
Taught in four-year college	32.4	39.1
Taught in elementary or secondary school	62.0	58.0
Taught eleven or more years in elementary or secondary school	23.6	11.8
Worked one to four years at present college	40.1	67.0
Worked eight years or more at present college	14.8	8.6
Worked less than one year at present college	18.7	9.0
Three years or less junior college experience	56.2	60.1
Specific training for junior college work:		
Had no formal courses designed specifically for junior college teaching	51.8	57.9
Had no informal or non-credit courses	75.8	81.8
Had no specific course on curriculum and purpose	58.8	63.7
Had not participated in in-service programs emphasizing junior college curriculum and purpose	58.6	71.2
Had taken junior college teaching methods course	16.5	9.9
No teaching methods courses of any type	14.3	23.4

variation in type of college from which members of the two groups obtained their degrees. There were only small differences as to geographical region in which respondents earned their degrees. The most noticeable differences were that 29.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group and 23.4 per cent of the satisfied group obtained their bachelor's degree from Florida colleges and universities. At the master's level, 30.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group earned their degrees in Florida, as compared with 25.1 per cent of the satisfied group.

It was noted that approximately 5 per cent of the satisfied group have no bachelor's degree, while only 2 per cent of the dissatisfied group have no such degree. At the master's level approximately 14 per cent of the satisfied group have not earned the degree, as contrasted with about 9 per cent of the dissatisfied group. The satisfied group had a slightly higher percentage of earned doctorates than the dissatisfied group. Most of the faculty with less than a master's degree are vocational-technical teachers, a relatively high percentage of whom are in the satisfied group. This, in part, accounts for the higher percentage of faculty members with less than a master's degree in the satisfied group.

At the bachelor's and master's degree level a larger percentage of the dissatisfied group attended college on a full-time basis. The difference was more pronounced at the master's level, where 60.8 per cent of the dissatisfied group attended full-time, as compared to 49.1 per cent of the satisfied group. The data concerning work being done by the faculty to earn the next higher degree shows no significant difference between the two groups. It was noted that only about one-third of those with master's degrees have done course work in a formal doctoral program. Slightly more than half of the dissatisfied group and less than half of the satisfied group, with less than a master's degree, are pursuing work to earn that degree.

There was no appreciable differences in grade point averages earned by members of the two groups as undergraduates. A slightly higher percentage of the satisfied group earned A's and a slightly higher percentage of the dissatisfied group earned B's and C's. The satisfied group reported 34.8 per cent of their number belonged to a college fraternity or sorority, as compared to 38.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group.

About 32 per cent of the satisfied group and 39 per cent of the dissatisfied group reported teaching experience in a four-year college or university. Approximately 62 per cent of the satisfied group and 58 per cent of the dissatisfied group had teaching experience in elementary or secondary schools. The chief difference noted here was that 23.6 per cent of the satisfied group had taught in elementary or secondary schools eleven or more years, as compared to 11.8 per cent of the dissatisfied group.

The satisfaction pattern based on number of years taught in present junior college presented an interesting picture. Sixty-seven per cent of the dissatisfied group had taught one to four years in their present junior college, whereas 40.1 per cent of the satisfied group had taught in their present college this length of time. The satisfied group reported that 14.8 per cent of their faculty members had taught in their present college eight years or more, as compared to 8.6 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Also 18.7 per cent of the satisfied group had worked less than one year in their present junior college, while 9 per cent of the dissatisfied group had worked in their present position for less than one year. The obvious conclusion is that more veteran teachers and newcomers were satisfied with their own college than those who had taught one to four years in their present institution. It was noted that 60.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group and 56.2 per cent of the satisfied group had three years or less of junior college work experience.

A large percentage of both groups reported that they had no courses or in-service training designed specifically as preparation for junior college teaching. With respect to formal courses designed to prepare for teaching in a junior college, 51.8 per cent of the satisfied group and 57.9 per cent of the dissatisfied group had taken no such courses. No informal courses or non-credit courses designed to assist in junior college teaching had been taken by 75.8 per cent of the satisfied group and 81.8 per cent of the dissatisfied group. No specific courses dealing with junior college curriculum and purpose had been taken by 58.8 per cent of the satisfied group and 63.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group. With regard to in-service training programs giving attention to junior college curriculum and purposes, 58.6 per cent of the satisfied group and 71.2 per cent of the dissatisfied group had not participated in such a program. Only 16.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 9.9 per cent of the dissatisfied group had taken a teaching methods course designed specifically for teaching in a junior college. Fourteen per cent of the satisfied group and 23.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group reported that they had taken no teaching methods courses of any type. These data contain unmistakable evidence that the dissatisfied group has had less specific training designed to improve junior college teaching. Not to the overlooked, however, is the fact that less than half of either group have had training designed specifically for junior college teaching.

Present Status and Position

Table 29 lists responses of the satisfied and dissatisfied groups on selected questions related to present position and status of faculty members.

As to faculty duties 70.9 per cent of the satisfied group were full-time teachers, while 75.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group were full-time teachers. Sixteen per cent of the satisfied group were full-time administrators compared to 9 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Full-time counselors comprised 4.2 per cent of the satisfied group and 5.2 per cent of the dissatisfied group. The dissatisfied group contained a slightly larger percentage of persons occupying dual positions of teacher-administrator and teacher-counselor than did the satisfied group. The implication of these data is, of course, that administrators tend to be more satisfied with their college than are treachers and counselors.

About half of the faculty in both groups obtained their present positions by initiating a letter or making a personal visit to the school. In the satisfied group, only 1.8 per cent obtained their present position through placement procedures of a graduate school, while 6.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group secured their present position by this method. Ten per cent of the satisfied group and 5.2 per cent of the dissatisfied group moved to their positions from some other school in the same junior college area. When asked if they had attempted to locate another position since obtaining their present position, 90.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 64.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group replied in the negative. Higher pay was given as the reason for attempting to obtain another job by 1.1 per cent of the satisfied group and 10.4 per cent of the dissatisfied. A more desirable school was reported by none of the satisfied group and 7.2 per cent of the dissatisfied group as their reason for attempting to locate another position.

TABLE 29

PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED GROUPS ON QUESTIONS RELATED TO PRESENT STATUS AND POSITION

Position and Status	Per Cent Satisfied Group	Per Cent Dissatisfied Group
Full-time teachers	70.9	75.7
Full-time administrators	16.1	9.0
Full-time counselors	4.2	5.2
Means of obtaining present position:		
Placement procedures of graduate school	1.8	6.3
Moved from other schools in same junior college district	10.1	5.2
Attempts to locate another position:		
Had not attempted to locate another position	90.5	64.4
Higher pay as reason for looking for another position	1.1	10.4
More desirable school as reason for looking for another position	0.0	7.2
Reason for leaving secondary school for junior college work:		
Prefer older students	15.6	11.0
More independence of work	10.6	14.4
Higher pay as reason for leaving four-year college for junior college work	4.4	8.6
Ten-month teacher salary of $9,000 and over	65.0	54.0
Annual non-teaching faculty salary $13,000 and over	55.0	34.0

Preference for older students was given by 15.6 per cent of the satisfied group and 11 per cent of the dissatisfied group as their principal reason for leaving primary and secondary schools for junior college work. On the other hand, 14.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group and 10.6 per cent of the satisfied group indicated that more independence of work was their main reason for changing from primary and secondary schools to junior college work. Higher yearly pay was given by 4.4 per cent of the satisfied group and 8.6 per cent of the dissatisfied group as the main reason for leaving a four-year college for junior college work. There were no marked differences in percentage of responses from the two groups on other reasons for leaving a four-year institution for a junior college position.

About 65 per cent of both groups worked 45 or more hours per week for their junior college. Likewise, there were no significant differences between the two groups in the percentage of time devoted by teaching personnel to various duties.

Teachers in the satisfied group earned more with 65 per cent of their number earning $9,000 or more for ten months' teaching, as contrasted with 54 per cent of the dissatisfied group that earned $9,000 or more. This difference in salary is accounted for mostly by the fact that, in general, members of the satisfied group are older and have been teaching longer, and are thus in higher pay brackets. Of those who indicated they were non-teaching faculty in the satisfied group, 55 per cent earned $13,000 or more per year, while only 34 per cent of the non-teaching faculty in the dissatisfied group earned $13,000 or more. This indicates that the higher paid administrators are more satisfied than the lower paid ones.

Satisfactions with Junior College Work

Table 30 shows the differences in responses of the satisfied group and dissatisfied group to questions related to satisfaction with junior college work.

When asked about their overall satisfaction with junior college teaching as a career, 74.2 per cent of the satisfied group were very satisfied as compared to 28.8 per cent of the dissatisfied group. However, 50.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group and 24.5 per cent of the satisfied group reported they were satisfied with junior college teaching as a career. With respect to their general attitude toward teaching as a career, a surprising 96.2 per cent of the satisfied group and 92.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group were satisfied or very satisfied.

Assuming salary, promotion, and security were equal, 71.2 per cent of the satisfied group and 35.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group stated they would prefer to teach in a junior college to other levels of teaching. Twenty per cent of the satisfied group and 51.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group preferred to teach in a four-year college or university. Less than 2 per cent of either group preferred high school teaching. These data suggest that many of the teachers, especially in the dissatisfied group, would move to a four-year college if given the opportunity.

TABLE 30

PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED GROUP AND DISSATISFIED GROUP ON QUESTIONS RELATING TO SATISFACTION WITH JUNIOR COLLEGE WORK

Satisfactions--Dissatisfactions	Per Cent Satisfied Group	Per Cent Dissatisfied Group
Overall satisfaction with junior college teaching as a career:		
Very satisfied	74.2	28.8
Satisfied	24.5	50.7
Prefer to teach in a junior college	71.2	35.4
Prefer to teach in a university	20.0	51.4
If living lives over again:		
Would teach in a junior college	65.9	30.9
Would teach in a university	19.4	40.3
Would choose a career outside of education	8.6	22.3
Favor faculty rank	46.9	53.8
Against faculty rank	18.5	22.1
Favor principle of merit pay	52.2	47.7
Favor nomenclature:		
Junior college	53.7	48.9
Community junior college	18.7	14.0
Community college	17.2	21.4
College	8.0	11.9
Main satisfaction with the nature of junior college work:		
Enjoyment of teaching	36.8	34.0
Helping young people grow	31.5	26.4
Dissatisfactions with nature of junior college work:		
Need to transmit elementary knowledge	11.0	16.0
Lack of time for research	7.1	14.4
No dissatisfaction	65.2	21.9

TABLE 30 (continued)

Satisfactions--Dissatisfactions	Per Cent Satisfied Group	Per Cent Dissatisfied Group
Main satisfaction with working conditions in a junior college:		
Freedom and independence of work	38.1	31.5
Desirable environment	19.4	14.9
Fine colleagues	18.3	21.4
Dissatisfactions with working conditions in a junior college:		
Poorly motivated students	20.7	23.7
Excessive classroom hours	4.6	18.7
No dissatisfactions	59.5	7.9
Main satisfaction with appreciations and rewards of junior college teaching:		
Personal satisfaction	40.1	40.8
Sense of social usefulness	33.7	28.8
Pay	11.0	15.5
Main dissatisfaction with junior college work:		
Administrative procedures	4.4	50.7
Pay	5.5	14.0
Student load	5.5	10.1
No dissatisfaction	62.3	4.3
Of most overall benefit to junior college:		
Higher pay	30.4	30.2
Lighter teaching load	12.1	22.1
Better facilities	16.5	7.7
More prestige for teachers	11.0	8.8

In response to the question of what vocation they would follow if they had their lives to live over again, 65.9 per cent of the satisfied group and 30.9 per cent of the dissatisfied group said they would teach in a junior college; 19.4 per cent of the satisfied group and 40.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group reported they would teach in a university, and 8.6 per cent of the satisfied group and 22.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group would choose a career outside of education. When asked if they expected to continue in junior college work until retirement, 73.1 per cent of the satisfied group and 42.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group said "yes"; 6 per cent of the satisfied group and 21.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group said "no"; and 20.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 36.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group said they "did not know."

With respect to use of faculty rank for all faculty members in the Florida junior college system, there was a higher percentage of the dissatisfied group favoring and opposing it. Favoring or strongly favoring faculty rank were 46.9 per cent of the satisfied group and 53.8 per cent of the dissatisfied group; 27.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 21 per cent of the dissatisfied group were neither for nor against it; and 18.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 22.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group were against or strongly against it.

Responses of the satisfied group indicated that 52.2 per cent of them favor the principle of merit pay as compared to 47.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group. As to the nomenclature preferred for their junior college, the two groups differed in the following respects: the name "Junior College" was preferred by 53.7 per cent of the satisfied group and 48.9 per cent of the dissatisfied group; "Community Junior College" was preferred by 18.7 per cent of the satisfied group and 14 per cent of the dissatisfied group; "Community College" was preferred by 17.2 per cent of the satisfied group and 21.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group; and "college" was preferred by 8 per cent of the satisfied group and 11.9 per cent of the dissatisfied group.

The most powerful voice in determining the educational program of their college was thought to be: the college president by 25.8 per cent of the satisfied group and 48.9 per cent of the dissatisfied group; the department and division heads by 15.4 per cent of the satisfied group and 7.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group; and deans by 9 per cent of the satisfied group and 10.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group; and the faculty by 7.9 per cent of the satisfied group and only 1.8 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Twenty-one per cent of the satisfied group and 14.6 per cent of the dissatisfied group considered power spread too wide to attribute to a single source. The high percentage of the dissatisfied group that believes the college president has the most powerful voice on campus may be another indication of their discontent with the limited role the faculty plays in institutional policy-formulation and decision-making.

The main reasons expressed for satisfaction with the nature of the junior college work were: enjoyment of teaching by 36.8 per cent of the satisfied group and 34 per cent of the dissatisfied group; and helping young people grow by 31.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 26.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group. The need to transmit elementary knowledge was given by 11 per cent of the satisfied group and 16 per cent of the dissatisfied group as a first reason for dissatisfaction with the nature of junior college work. Another first reason, for dissatisfaction with the nature of junior college work selected by 7.1 per cent of the satisfied group and 14.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group was lack of time for research. Of significance is the fact that 65.2 per cent of the satisfied group reported no dissatisfaction with the nature of junior college work; however, only 21.9 per cent of the dissatisfied group gave the same response.

The main satisfactions with working conditions in a junior college were identified as: freedom and independence in work by 38.1 per cent of the satisfied group and 31.5 per cent of the dissatisfied group; desirable environment by 19.4 per cent of the satisfied group and 14.9

per cent of the dissatisfied group; and fine colleagues by 18.3 per cent of the satisfied group and 21.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Both groups indentified poorly motivated students as their main dissatisfaction with working conditions in a junior college. This selection was made by 20.7 per cent of the satisfied group and 23.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Another dissatisfaction chosen by 4.6 per cent of the satisfied group and 18.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group was excessive classroom hours. Also worthy of note is that 59.5 per cent of the satisfied group and only 7.9 per cent of the dissatisfied group reported no dissatisfactions with working conditions in a junior college.

The two groups responded very much the same to the request for identification of the main satisfactions with the appreciations and rewards of junior college teaching. About 40 per cent of both groups selected personal satisfaction. Sense of social usefulness was selected by 33.7 per cent of the satisfied group and 28.8 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Pay was the choice of 11 per cent of the satisfied group and 15.5 per cent of the dissatisfied group.

Respondents were asked to select their main dissatisfactions with junior college work with the following results: administrative procedures was chosen by 4.4 per cent of the satisfied group and 50.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group; pay was identified by 5.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 14 per cent of the dissatisfied group; and student load was selected by 5.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 10.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Over 62 per cent of the satisfied group reported no dissatisfactions with junior college work, while only 4.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group reported no dissatisfactions.

In listing factors which they considered as having the most overall benefit to junior college work, respondents selected the following items: higher pay by about 30 per cent of both groups; lighter teaching load by 12.1 per cent of the satisfied group and 22.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group; better facilities by 16.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 7.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group; and more prestige for teachers by 11 per cent of the satisfied group and 8.8 per cent of the dissatisfied group.

Attitude on Importance of Community Junior College Functions

This section compares the percentages of the satisfied group and dissatisfied group that accept or reject certain functions usually associated with a comprehensive community junior college. The general question on where emphasis should be placed on junior college functions, brought forth a response from 59.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 55 per cent of the dissatisfied group that emphasis should be placed about equally on transfer, terminal, and community service functions. The remainder of both groups selected alternatives which would give less emphasis to one or more of these three functions, especially the community service function. The point for concern here is not so much the differences in responses of the two groups, but that a sizeable minority of both groups does not accept the community service function as important.

A list of 31 questions concerning functions, programs, and activities often performed in comprehensive community junior colleges was included in the questinnaire to determine the degree of importance accorded by faculty members to each item as a function of a Florida community junior college. Responses of "Very important function of a junior college" and "Important function of a junior college" were combined into a category indicating acceptance of the function as important; whereas responses "Of little importance as a junior college function" and "Should not be a function of a junior college" were combined into a category indicating rejection of the function as important. Table 31 sets forth the percentages of the satisfied and dissatisfied groups that accepted and rejected each function listed.

One of the more striking features, reflected by Table 31, is that all items, except one, were accepted as important functions by a larger percentage of the satisfied group than of the dissatisfied group. The reader will note that, on the majority of items, there was a separation of 10 percentage points or more between the two groups. Taken as a whole, these data demonstrate that the satisfied group more readily accepted the role and functions of a comprehensive community college than did the dissatisfied group.

More specifically, the transfer program, terminal program, evening courses, and guided or developmental studies were accepted as important by more than 90 per cent of the satisfied group and over 80 per cent of the dissatisfied group. General education courses, adult non-credit courses, concerts and plays, adult personal enrichment courses, and short courses for industry were accepted as important by over 75 per cent of the satisfied group and more than 65 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Public forums and adult vocational courses were accepted by about 60 per cent of the satisfied group and about half of the dissatisfied group. The academic functions receiving least acceptance by both groups were: elderly citizens courses with 51.7 per cent of the satisfied group and 39.2 per cent of the dissatisfied group; and high school completion courses with only 30.9 per cent of the satisfied group and 27 per cent of the dissatisfied group.

On questions related to guidance and student activities there was usually more separation in percentage of acceptance by the two groups. Most of these items were accepted as important by 75 per cent or more of the satisfied group and 60 per cent or more of the dissatisfied group. Athletics and student recreation and similar functions were considered less important by both groups than such items as career selection counseling and developing civic responsibility.

The one item on which both groups were in agreement concerned restricted admission policy to college transfer courses. About 61 per cent of both groups favored such a policy. An open admission policy to all courses was accepted by 61.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 42.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group.

TABLE 31

PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED GROUPS ON QUESTIONS RELATED TO IMPORTANCE OF JUNIOR COLLEGE FUNCTIONS

	Per Cent Satisfied Group		Per Cent Dissatisfied Group	
	Accepted	Rejected	Accepted	Rejected
Guided or developmental studies in English (written)	94.3	4.2	83.6	15.1
Guided or developmental studies in mathematics	92.8	5.5	80.4	17.6
Guided or developmental studies in study skills	91.9	6.4	82.0	16.3
Guided or developmental studies in reading	93.6	4.9	83.8	14.2
Transfer (college parallel) program	96.1	1.9	92.4	6.6
Terminal program	93.6	4.4	85.6	13.1
Adult non-credit courses	81.8	16.7	69.0	29.6
Evening courses of all types	92.0	6.1	84.9	13.8
High school completion courses	30.9	67.4	27.0	71.9
Adult vocational courses	63.9	34.4	51.4	47.3
Elderly citizens courses	51.7	46.9	39.2	59.7
General education courses	87.9	10.6	82.9	16.0
Public forums	60.6	37.9	57.2	41.2
Concerts, plays, etc.	78.4	20.3	71.4	27.3
Adult personal enrichment courses, e.g., art, music, literature	78.5	20.4	67.8	31.3
Counseling on personal problems	81.5	17.4	66.9	32.0

TABLE 31 (continued)

PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED GROUPS ON QUESTIONS RELATED TO IMPORTANCE OF JUNIOR COLLEGE FUNCTIONS

	Per Cent Satisfied Group		Per Cent Dissatisfied Group	
	Accepted	Rejected	Accepted	Rejected
Career selection counseling	93.0	5.7	82.0	16.9
Student government	82.2	16.8	63.7	35.2
Student interest clubs and honorary societies	79.5	19.4	63.0	35.9
Student recreation	75.3	23.4	59.2	39.6
Personal relationships between faculty and student	87.7	11.0	80.6	18.0
Athletics (intercollegiate and/or intramural)	73.4	25.1	59.2	39.7
Provide financial assistance to students	89.0	9.9	83.1	16.0
Preparation for marriage and family life	74.6	24.2	60.1	39.2
Developing good health habits	78.9	19.8	54.2	45.0
Developing social competence	83.7	15.2	63.3	36.0
Developing civic responsibility	90.8	8.1	76.8	22.5
Data gathering on students and its use by the faculty	76.7	22.8	61.0	37.4
Short courses for business and industry	84.8	14.1	67.4	31.9
Open admission policy to all courses	61.5	36.1	42.1	56.6
Restricted admission policy to college transfer courses	61.3	35.9	61.5	36.7

Attitude on Counseling and Guidance

The two groups were compared on their answers to several questions related to counseling and guidance functions. Table 32 shows the differences in responses of the satisfied group and dissatisfied group in relation to attitudes on selected counseling and guidance functions.

About two-thirds of both groups said classroom teachers should and do spend 10 to 20 per cent of their time on academic advision concerned with course work.

TABLE 32

PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED GROUPS ON SELECTED QUESTIONS RELATED TO ATTITUDES ON GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING FUNCTIONS

Guidance Function	Per Cent Satisfied Group	Per Cent Dissatisfied Group
Classroom teacher should spend no time on:		
Academic advising	5.7	6.3
Personal counseling	19.6	21.9
Academic and personal problems are better handled by classroom teachers than professional counselors	4.9	9.7
Orientation of new students should be concentrated in:		
Before enrollment	30.4	29.1
Throughout the first semester	25.6	22.1
During the first week of school	23.4	18.9
Not effective enough to matter	5.3	16.7
Disagree that junior colleges over-counsel on personal and life adjustment problems	69.3	53.8
Faculty members should participate as advisors, chaperones, etc., in student extracurricular activities	61.7	33.1
Desire to participate in student extracurricular activities:		
Very much	11.9	8.6
Some	53.3	40.5
Very little	21.2	27.9
Not at all	13.8	22.1

TABLE 32 (continued)

Guidance Function	Per Cent Satisfied Group	Per Cent Dissatisfied Group
Junior colleges should encourage students to participate in:		
Clubs	74.0	68.7
Recreation	66.1	62.4
All types of counseling as compared to academic instruction are:		
More important	3.5	6.7
Equally important	62.8	51.4
Less important	29.1	35.1
Academic advising compared to academic instruction is:		
Less important	6.4	6.8
Equally important	65.9	54.0
More important	23.1	33.3
Counseling on personal problems compared to academic instruction is:		
More important	6.2	7.4
Equally important	52.2	45.3
Less important	35.7	40.5
Personal counseling in a junior college compared to a university is:		
More important	32.2	29.1
Equally important	54.4	53.8
Less important	9.5	11.5

Almost as many from both groups believed that the classroom instructor should and does spend 10 to 20 per cent of their time advising students on personal problems. On the other hand, 5.7 per cent of the satisfied group and 6.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group said no time should be spent by the classroom teacher on academic advising; and 19.6 per cent of the satisfied group and 21.9 per cent of the dissatisfied group expressed the opinion that the classroom teacher should spend no time on personal counseling.

A very revealing question was asked on what functions the junior college should rely primarily on professionally trained counselors for elicited these responses: 35.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 34.5 per cent of the dissatisfied group said personal problems other than class work; 10.4 per cent of the satisfied group and 8.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group said academic advising; 47.4 per cent of the satisfied group and 45.5 per cent of the dissatisfied group said both academic and personal problems; and 4.9 per cent of the satisfied group and 9.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group said both types of problems are better handled by the classroom teachers. This question illustrates the basic disagreement which seems to exist among the faculty on the proper roles of counselors and classroom teachers with respect to the advising and counseling function.

Faculty opinion on the period in which orientation of new students should be concentrated varied widely, with "before enrollment," "throughout the first semester" and "during the first week of school" each being selected by more than 18 per cent of both groups. The two groups differed most when 5.3 per cent of the satisfied group and 16.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group voiced the opinion that "orientation is not effective enough to matter when it is done."

To the statement that "junior colleges devote too much time and effort to counseling on personal or life adjustment problems," 63.9 per cent of the satisfied group and 53.8 per cent of the dissatisfied group disagreed or strongly disagreed. More than 80 per cent of both groups disagreed with the statement that "in junior colleges which accept most all applicants there is no reason for extensive testing of new students."

The satisfied group, by a 61.7 per cent vote, accepted the position that faculty members should expect to participate as advisors, chaperones, etc., in student extracurricular activities, while only 33.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group agreed with the position. Sixty-five per cent of the satisfied group and 49.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group indicated a desire to participate some or much as an advisor, chaperone, etc., in student extracurricular activities. The faculty members who did not desire to participate at all in student extracurricular activities numbered 13.8 per cent of the satisfied group and 22.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group. More of the satisfied group than the dissatisfied group thought that the junior college should encourage students to participate in student clubs and student recreation. Seventy-four per cent of the satisfied group and 68.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group favored encouragement of students to participate in student clubs "extensively" or "when convenient." Also, 66.1 per cent of the satisfied group and 62.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group favored encouragement of students to participate in student recreation activities "extensively" or "when convenient."

A slightly larger percentage of the dissatisfied group were advising students on academic and personal problems than was the case with the satisfied group. In part, this may be accounted for by the larger percentage of administrators in the satisfied group. Some academic advising is performed by 68.5 per cent of the satisfied group and 73.8 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Some counseling on problems other than academic is performed by 51.7 per cent of the satisfied group and 61.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group.

The faculty members were asked to weigh the relative importance of various types of counseling as compared to academic instruction. Counseling of all types was considered equally as important as academic instruction by 62.8 per cent of the satisfied group and 51.4 per cent of the dissatisfied group; while it was considered less important by 29.1 per cent of the satisfied group and 35.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Similarly, 65.9 per cent of the satisfied group and 54 per cent of the dissatisfied group considered academic advising on course selection and progress in course work equally as important as academic instruction, while 23.1 per cent of the satisfied group and 33.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group consider it less important. The pattern changes some on the matter of counseling on personal problems. Fifty-two per cent of the satisfied group and 45.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group believed counseling on personal problems was equally as important as academic instruction, while 35.7 per cent of the satisfied group and 40.5 per cent of the dissatisfied group considered it less important. Counseling on personal problems was considered equally important or more important in a junior college than in a four-year college by 86.6 per cent of the satisfied group and 82.9 per cent of the dissatisfied group.

Satisfactions with Own Junior College

As previously pointed out, members of the satisfied and dissatisfied groups compared in this chapter were selected on the basis of the highest and lowest scores, respectively, on a group of fifty-nine questions concerning the faculty members' degree of satisfaction with various features and activities of their own junior college. For this reason, as a group, responses from the satisfied group concerning satisfactions with own junior college had to indicate a higher degree of satisfaction than responses from the dissatisfied group. Thus, the basis for analysis was not which group showed the greatest satisfaction, but rather, how much difference or spread occurred between the responses of the two groups, and the relative degree of satisfaction expressed by the two groups.

The first five questions asked the faculty member to compare certain features of his own junior college with his concept of a good public junior college. In making this comparison, 98.7 per cent of the satisfied group and 76.2 per cent of the dissatisfied group considered the qualifications of their own faculty good or very good. The quality of teaching in their own junior college was thought to be good or very good by 98.2 per cent of the satisfied group and 69.9 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Sixty-four per cent of the satisfied group and 23.6 per cent of the dissatisfied group considered quality of their students good or very good. The quality of their college administration was considered good or very good by 98.1 per cent of the satisfied group and 23.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group. As to the quality of student government in their own college, 67.2 per cent of the satisfied group and 13.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group said it was good or very good.

The flow of significant information, views, and opinions between the administration and the faculty was considered inadequate by 1.8 per cent of the satisfied group and 77.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Similarly, 10.8 per cent of the satisfied group and 77.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group thought that the flow of significant information, views, and opinions between faculty members in different areas of their college was inadequate. The high percentage of the dissatisfied group who consider the flow of information inadequate is another indication of their feeling of isolation and lack of being an integral part of the faculty group.

With respect to faculty influence and participation in various functions: 88.3 per cent of the satisfied group and 19.1 per cent of the dissatisfied group thought it was about right in selection of new faculty members; 94.7 per cent of the satisfied group and 27.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group considered it about right in assignment of class schedules; 93.8 per cent of the satisfied group and 40.6 per cent of the dissatisfied group believed it was about right in student disciplinary matters; and 77.3 per cent of the satisfied group and 18.3 per cent of the dissatisfied group stated it was about right in design of new buildings.

Faculty morale among immediate co-workers of respondents was considered: good or very good by 95.2 per cent of the satisfied group and 28.8 per cent of the dissatisfied group; average by 4 per cent of the satisfied group and 32 per cent of the dissatisfied group; and poor or very poor by .9 per cent of the satisfied group and 38.8 per cent of the dissatisfied group. Morale of the faculty throughout their school was considered: good or very good by 94.8 per cent of the satisfied group and 16.5 per cent of the dissatisfied group; average by 5.3 per cent of the satisfied group and 44.8 per cent of the dissatisfied group; and poor or very poor by none of the satisfied group and 38.7 per cent of the dissatisfied group.

Table 33 lists forty-six items concerning their institution on which respondents were requested to indicate their degree of satisfaction. For purposes of this comparison, responses "Entirely satisfied" and "Reasonably satisfied" have been combined to indicate satisfaction, and responses "Somewhat dissatisfied" and "Completely dissatisfied" have been combined to indicate dissatisfaction.

TABLE 33

PERCENTAGES OF SATISFIED AND DISSATISFIED GROUPS ON QUESTIONS RELATED TO SATISFACTIONS WITH OWN JUNIOR COLLEGE

Function or Feature	Per Cent Satisfied Group		Per Cent Dissatisfied Group	
	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Admission policy	90.6	2.2	44.4	27.0
Pre-admission counseling	81.7	4.9	22.8	56.0
Registration procedures	82.4	4.4	21.9	56.4
Classroom facilities	90.1	3.5	40.3	40.8
Parking facilities	88.5	5.1	37.0	54.3
Eating facilities	68.9	16.7	16.7	71.2

TABLE 33 (continued)

Function or Feature	Per Cent Satisfied Group		Per Cent Dissatisfied Group	
	Satis-fied	Dissat-isfied	Satis-fied	Dissat-isfied
Physical education facilities	82.4	8.2	41.9	38.1
General education program	97.3	0.0	50.0	13.8
Student counseling services	86.4	2.7	28.9	36.3
Purchasing policies	84.2	2.3	12.2	57.5
Services offered in guided or developmental studies	91.6	.2	35.9	22.1
Quality of students attracted to your school	83.1	2.0	30.6	32.9
Number of students in classrooms	86.1	5.0	25.0	56.3
Student-teacher ratio	86.8	3.3	24.3	55.0
Length of class period	95.8	1.1	69.8	14.8
Faculty office facilities	84.1	9.2	31.6	56.7
Library materials (books and periodicals)	96.9	1.1	53.1	28.0
Audio-visual materials	95.6	4.0	51.8	26.3
Expendable supplies	95.7	4.0	44.8	32.9
Number and size of student scholarships	81.9	4.2	34.9	28.7
Number and nature of personnel policies	94.5	.7	9.0	54.0
Clerical assistance	81.1	4.9	22.9	54.1
Procedures for obtaining new library materials	95.2	1.1	50.5	21.4

TABLE 32 (continued)

Function or Feature	Per Cent Satisfied Group		Per Cent Dissatisfied Group	
	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Effectiveness in obtaining new library materials	97.2	1.3	43.7	25.9
School catalog	96.3	.7	42.8	28.2
Library reading area	94.5	2.6	55.2	25.7
Student lounge or center	81.1	8.6	22.1	60.9
Auditorium facilities	72.7	17.0	27.9	59.9
Reserve book procedures in library	95.9	1.1	60.2	13.7
Library hours	96.9	.9	59.9	18.3
Responsiveness of librarians to faculty and student needs	98.6	.4	69.2	13.5
Student social program in general	79.8	2.4	25.7	28.8
Regulations on student dress	79.8	5.5	32.7	41.9
School newspaper	82.0	4.0	32.2	40.8
Present grading practices (A, B, C, D, etc.)	92.8	1.6	45.0	29.2
Teaching load	89.0	2.2	25.5	53.2
Student contact hours	90.7	2.4	28.6	43.3
Provisions for professional and sabbatical leave	84.1	4.9	23.2	51.2
Faculty participation in curriculum development	91.8	1.7	14.0	60.4
Faculty in-service training programs	75.3	4.6	12.4	67.5
College organization and administrative procedures	96.1	0.0	9.7	70.7
Effectiveness of the faculty handbook	92.0	.6	14.4	52.8

TABLE 32 (continued)

Function or Feature	Per Cent Satisfied Group		Per Cent Dissatisfied Group	
	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
Time available for professional study and preparation for classes	83.5	4.8	16.2	56.4
Faculty participation in institutional policy-formulation and decision-making	88.1	.9	3.7	82.9
Effectiveness of faculty meetings	78.2	21.4	5.0	76.4
Orientation procedures for new faculty members	87.7	1.9	22.8	46.9

As shown in Table 33, there was a difference or spread of 26 to 86 percentage points between those in both groups indicating satisfaction on the various questions. Among those high satisfaction items with the least amount of spread were: length of class period--26 percentage points; responsiveness of librarians--29 percentage points; reserve book procedures--36 percentage points; and library hours--27 percentage points.

Other items on which 50 per cent or more of the dissatisfied group expressed satisfaction included: general education program--50 per cent; library materials--53.1 per cent; audio-visual materials--51.8 per cent; procedures for obtaining new library materials--50.5 per cent; and library reading area--55.2 per cent.

The greatest difference or spread between the percentage of those indicating satisfaction with various items were: college organization and administrative procedures--86 percentage points; faculty participation in institutional policy-formulation and decision-making--84 percentage points; effectiveness of faculty handbook--78 percentage points; faculty participation in curriculum development--78 percentage points; and effectiveness of faculty meetings--73 percentage points.

The items on which the highest percentage of the dissatisfied group indicated dissatisfaction were: faculty participation in institutional policy-formulation and decision-making--82.9 per cent; effectiveness of faculty meetings--76.4 per cent; eating facilities--71.2 per cent; college organization and administrative procedures--70.7 per cent; faculty in-service programs--67.5 per cent; student center or lounge--60.9 per cent; auditorium facilities--59.9 per cent; purchasing policies--57.5 per cent; faculty office facilities--56.7 per cent; time available for professional study and preparation for classes--56.4 per cent; registration procedures--56.4 per cent; number of students in classrooms--56.3 per cent; pre-admission counseling--56 per cent; and student-teacher ratio--55 per cent.

These data bear out the findings in Chapter II that the faculty are fairly satisfied with library services; relatively satisfied with some physical facilities and some student services; relative dissatisfied with their teaching load; and relatively dissatisfied with organization and administration and degree of faculty participation in their college.

Summary

Throughout this chapter comparisons of the satisfied and dissatisfied groups have revealed some similarities between the two groups, and have also identified some interesting differences concerning personal background, educational preparation, teaching experience, present position, satisfaction with junior college work in general, attitudes on functions of a comprehensive junior college; attitudes on counseling and guidance, and satisfactions with features and conditions of their own junior college. In a very general sense, faculty members constituting the group satisfied with features and conditions in their own junior college, as compared to the dissatisfied group, can be described as follows:

1. Are older, most being over 40 years of age, have a larger percentage of females, and more likely to have served in and/or be retired from the armed forces.

2. Spent youth on a farm or in a city of 10,000 or less and adulthood in a city of 50,000 or less.

3. Belong to one or more civic groups, professional or scholarly organizations, and educational organizations of a general nature; and participate in church activities regularly.

4. Family is very satisfied with community in which they live.

5. Have more teaching experience in elementary or secondary schools, and may have had courses or in-service training designed specifically for improving junior college teaching.

6. Have a larger number of administrators, and both teaching and non-teaching personnel earn higher salaries.

7. Are very satisfied with junior college teaching as a career, prefer teaching in a junior college to any other level, and expect to remain in junior college work until retirement.

8. Have no dissatisfactions with junior college work, and their main satisfactions are: enjoyment of teaching, helping young people grow, freedom and independence of work, personal satisfaction, and sense of social usefulness.

9. Favor principle of merit pay, but not academic rank.

10. Accept, to a greater degree, the usual functions of a comprehensive junior college; and favor open admission policy to all courses.

11. Believe faculty members should participate as advisors and chaperones in student extracurricular activities, and often participate in such activities.

12. Believe counseling of all types is equally as important as academic instruction.

13. Consider quality of their students, faculty morale, and college administration good.

14. Satisfied with the flow of information, faculty participation and influence in various college activities; and in general, with other features, activities, and programs of their own junior college.

The characteristics of members of the dissatisfied group, as compared to the satisfied group, might be listed as follows:

1. Are younger, most under 40, have a smaller percentage of females, and less likely to have served in and/or be retired from the armed forces.

2. Spent youth in a city of 50,000 or more and adulthood in a city of 100,000 or more.

3. Belong to professional or scholarly organizations, educational organizations of a general nature, but not to a civic organization; and participate irregularly in church activities.

4. Have teaching experience in elementary or secondary schools, have less than three years junior college experience, and have taken few, if any, courses or in-service training designed to improve their teaching effectivenss in a junior college.

5. Have a larger number of teachers and counselors, and salary is less for both teaching and non-teaching personnel.

6. Are less satisfied with junior college teaching as a career, prefer to teach in a four-year college or university, and do not know or do not expect to stay in junior college work until retirement.

7. Have same satisfactions with junior college work to a lesser degree; main dissatisfactions are: administrative procedures, poorly motivated students, excessive classroom hours, and the need to transmit elementary knowledge.

8. Favor faculty rank, but not the principle of merit pay.

9. Accept, but to a lesser degree, many functions of a comprehensive junior college, but reject some of the community service functions.

10. Do not believe faculty members should participate as advisors and chaperones to student extracurricular activities, and do not desire to play such a role very often.

11. Believe counseling is important, but have reservations about personal counseling as an important function of a junior college.

12. Are not pleased with quality of their students, faculty morale, or administration in their college.

13. Are not satisfied with flow of information, faculty participation and influence in college activities, organization and administration of their college, teaching load, faculty meetings, faculty in-service training programs, and some physical facilities.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

There have been numerous changes, but few of major proporations, in the backgrounds, attitudes, and opinions of Florida community junior college faculty members as a group.

No one specific pattern of background, experience, and educational preparation was identified as the "ideal mix" for selecting a competent and dedicated junior college faculty, but there is some evidence that the better junior college faculty members have had specific training for junior college work.

In general, the satisfied faculty member contributed more to achieving objectives and purposes of the Florida comprehensive community college because of: his greater acceptance of the community service function; his greater participation in student extracurricular activities and community civic and religious activities; his greater willingness to assist students with personal as well as academic problems; his greater acceptance of the open door policy; his greater amount of training in courses and in-service training designed specifically to improve junior college teaching.

The data suggest the possibility of another type of faculty member in a few small junior colleges, who is satisfied and content with things as they are, and has no desire to change or improve the effectiveness of his college. If this type of faculty members do, in fact, exist, they probably represent a small group, but their high degree of satisfaction would constitute a hinderance rather than an asset to progress and increased professional competence in their faculties. In making plans for increased institutional effectivenss, administrators must recognize the possibility that this type of faculty member exists and take positive steps to gain his cooperation, possibly by attempting to remove some of his complacency.

The majority of the faculty is relatively satisfied with his profession, his working conditions, his community, his associates, and his students; he works hard to do his job well; and is interested in improving his effectiveness and that of his institution. However, the fact that 25 per cent or more are dissatisfied with numerous features and conditions of their institution is ample grounds for concern and initiation of positive programs.

There are still divergent opinions on the proper role of teachers and counselors in advising and counseling students on academic, personal, and career problems, and, indeed, on the scope of the college's responsibility in this area. These responsibilities need to be studied and defined if the most effective job is to be done.

There is less concern among the faculty on the primacy of additional pay raises, and more concern with their teaching situation on such matters as teaching load, student-teacher ratio, student contact hours, grading practices, number of students in classrooms, and physical facilities.

The fact that the majority of faculty members have not taken courses or participated in in-service training designed specifically to improve junior college teaching and understanding the role and philosophy of the comprehensive junior college appears to be a major weakness.

A significant area of dissatisfaction concerns college organization and administrative procedures, faculty participation in institutional policy-formulation and decision-making, effectivensss of faculty meetings, and adequacy of communications. There appears to be a growing trend on the part of faculty members to insist on participation in decisions which affect them and their work and to distrust administrators when they are not given this opportunity.

In terms of degrees and specific training for junior college teaching, faculty qualifications have dropped since 1962. Although recent increases in salary scales will help, the competition to hire and retain outstanding faculty members for the junior colleges will continue.

Recommendations

Faculty improvement programs should be strengthened at the college and state level. At the college level, in-service training programs, which emphasize improvement in junior college teaching, curriculum improvement, and the role and purposes of the comprehensive junior college, should be expanded. Additional resources should be sought for an expanded program of leaves of absence and sabbatical leaves to permit faculty members to take courses and otherwise pursue activities to improve their professional competence. An active program is needed at the state level to select outstanding faculty members for additional graduate training supported by fellowships.

Administrators should examine thoroughly and plan carefully the course of action needed in their institutions to improve communications, organization, and administrative procedures and a sense of participation in institutional affairs by faculty members. Much can be done in this area without additional resources.

The increased dissatisfaction with the teaching situation requires attention in most colleges. Many teachers are asking for a lighter teaching load, a lower student-teacher ratio, better facilities, and more time for professional improvement and preparation for classes. This will require additional resources, but the problem should be recognized and priorities established to improve the situation as resources can be made available.

The divergent opinions on the scope and responsiblity for the counseling and guidance function suggests the need for a state-wide study to clarify and establish guidelines in this area.

The lack of information on Florida community junior college faculty members, dissatisfaction with college programs and procedures, and non-acceptance of some functions in the junior college suggests the need for expanded institutional research effort in some colleges. Several colleges already have active programs and the Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, is a step in the right direction.

The data collected in this study are available in the Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, and should be used for additional studies such as: differences in vocational-technical teachers and academic teachers, differences in faculty members recruited from four-year colleges and those from primary and secondary schools, differences in administrators and teachers, etc.

Since this study deals with the junior college faculty, a recent study by Atwell (2) examined community and institutional characteristics influencing the junior college transfer program, it follows that a state-wide study of the characteristics, attitudes, and opinions of students would contribute materially to the current body of knowledge on Florida's community junior college system.

Warranting further study and verification is the implication that there may be several sub-classifications within "satisfied" and "dissatisfied" faculty groups, and that some satisfied and some dissatisfied faculty members support and contribute to the effectiveness of their institution, and vice versa.

The continuing expansion and maturity of the Florida junior college system will probably result in additional changes in faculty characteristics and attitudes. It is recommended that this study be repeated in five years to provide current information on these changes.

APPENDIX A

JUNIOR COLLEGES PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

JUNIOR COLLEGES PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

Junior College	Counties Comprising the Junior College District
Brevard Junior College	Brevard
Broward Junior College	Broward
Central Florida Junior College	Marion Citrus Levy
Chipola Junior College	Jackson Calhoun Holmes Washington
Daytona Beach Junior College	Volusia Flagler
Edison Junior College	Lee Charlotte Collier Glades Hendry
Florida Junior College at Jacksonville	Duval Nassau
Florida Keys Junior College	Monroe
Gulf Coast Junior College	Bay Gulf
Indian River Junior College	St. Lucie Indian River Martin Ockeechobee
Lake City Junior College and Forest Ranger School	Columbia Baker Dixie Gilchrist Union

Junior College	Counties Comprising the Junior College District
Lake-Sumter Junior College	Lake Sumter
Manatee Junior College	Manatee Sarasota
Miami-Dade Junior College	Dade
North Florida Junior College	Madison Hamilton Lafayette Suwannee Taylor
Okaloosa-Walton Junior College	Okaloosa Walton
Palm Beach Junior College	Palm Beach
Pensacola Junior College	Escambia Santa Rosa
Polk Junior College	Polk
St. Johns River Junior College	Putnam Clay St. Johns
St. Petersburg Junior College	Pinellas
Santa Fe Junior College	Alachua Bradford
Seminole Junior College	Seminole
South Florida Junior College	Highlands Hardee
Tallahassee Junior College	Leon Wakulla Gadsden
Valencia Junior College	Orange

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE INCLUDING PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES FROM FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS

____
College No.

FLORIDA COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE

FACULTY OPINION SURVEY

Conducted by Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, for the Division of Community Junior Colleges, Florida State Department of Education. 1968.

GENERAL INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS

The Division of Community Junior Colleges, State Department of Education, has initiated an extensive state-wide study of personal and educational backgrounds, and attitudes and opinions of faculty members in Florida's community junior colleges. The Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, has been commissioned to conduct the study for the Division of Community Junior Colleges. The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information for use in the study.

This questionnaire is being sent to every teacher, counselor, and administrator, and data will be machine processed. No signature is necessary, and the completed questionnaires are to be in no way identified with individual respondents. The number on the cover is the code number assigned to your college.

Machine processing places certain restrictions on available answers to some questions. If the answer is a numerical quantity, i.e., your age or your salary, please check the most nearly correct answer. If the answer indicates an attitude or an opinion, select the answer most nearly representative of your position. It is emphasized that the questions concerning your attitude, position, or opinion on various subjects should be answered from a purely personal point of view. When your response to a question is "Other," please write in appropriate word(s) if you can describe what "Other" means in your particular situation.

Questions which apply only to certain categories of personnel have been grouped together. Instructions have been inserted indicating who should answer these questions. Unless a question is specifically restricted, everyone should answer it.

Please complete the questionnaire and mail it by August 31, 1968, directly to the Institute of Higher Education in the stamped envelope provided. Also please forward the enclosed card to your college president indicating that you have completed and mailed the questionnaire.

The purpose of this project is to improve your junior college system. Your prompt assistance is appreciated.

1. What is your present position in your junior college?

A full-time member of the staff and faculty with duties as:

71.8 1. Full-time teacher
12.7 2. Full-time administrator
9.4 3. Part-time teacher--part-time administrator
4.0 4. Full-time counselor
1.3 5. Part-time teacher--part-time counselor
0.8 6. Part-time administrator--part-time counselor

or

A part-time member of the staff and faculty with duties as:

0 7. Part-time teacher
0 8. Part-time administrator
0 9. Part-time counselor

2. What is your age?
(Your last birthday)

3.5 1. 20-24
13.7 2. 25-29
13.4 3. 30-34
13.4 4. 35-39
15.8 5. 40-44
14.3 6. 45-49
13.0 7. 50-54
7.0 8. 55-59
5.3 9. 60-over

3. Sex

68.4 1. male
30.1 2. female

4. What is your marital status?

16.3 1. single
74.6 2. married
5.8 3. divorced or otherwise separated
1.7 4. widowed

5. How many children do you have?

16.3 1. 1
25.7 2. 2
15.7 3. 3
6.8 4. 4
2.7 5. 5
0.7 6. 6
0.6 7. 7 or more
29.8 8. None

6. How many persons including yourself are living as part of your family unit (household)?

16.1 1. 1
24.3 2. 2
19.2 3. 3
20.4 4. 4
12.0 5. 5
4.4 6. 6
2.8 7. 7 or more

7. Have you served in the Armed Forces?

48.4 1. Yes
50.4 2. No

8. Are you retired from the Armed Forces and now receiving a pension or retirement pay?

9.5 1. Yes
88.5 2. No

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

ONLY FULL-TIME PERSONNEL WHO ARE PRIMARILY TEACHING FACULTY ARE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS 9 THROUGH 19. PART-TIME PERSONNEL GO DIRECTLY TO QUESTION 31. THOSE WHO ARE FULL-TIME BUT PRIMARILY ADMINISTRATORS, COUNSELORS, OR OTHER NON-TEACHING STAFF GO DIRECTLY TO QUESTION 20.

9. What is your income from normal teaching load salary for 10 months? (Choose the nearest figure)

0.6 1. $6,000 or less
1.6 2. $6,500
3.5 3. $7,000
5.9 4. $7,500
9.9 5. $8,000
9.1 6. $8,500
9.8 7. $9,000
14.5 8. $9,500
24.3 9. $10,500 or more

10. Do you carry an "overload" for additional compensation?

25.3 1. Yes
51.9 2. No

11. What is your supplemental income from overload and summer session or other duties?

5.2 1. $500
3.4 2. $600
1.3 3. $700
3.8 4. $800
2.2 5. $900
4.5 6. $1,000
3.2 7. $1,100
22.7 8. $1,200 or more
30.6 9. None

(ON THE FOLLOWING AND SIMILAR MULTIPLE QUESTIONS, PLEASE ANSWER EACH OF THE NUMBERED QUESTIONS)

What percentage of your time do you devote to the following duties? Do not exceed a total of 100% on questions 12-19 collectively.

		PERCENTAGE OF TIME								
		10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	None
12.	Lesson Preparation	9.7 1.	24.2 2.	23.4 3.	10.4 4.	3.7 5.	1.7 6.	0.27 7.	0.1 8.	1.0 9.
13.	Presentation of Lesson Text	7.3 1.	16.7 2.	21.6 3.	14.2 4.	8.8 5.	2.7 6.	0.7 7.	0.5 8.	2.0 9.
14.	Professional Study	39.6 1.	15.4 2.	4.2 3.	0.8 4.	0.4 5.	0.0 6.	0.1 7.	0.0 8.	13.9 9.
15.	Student Counseling	43.0 1.	11.8 2.	2.8 3.	0.5 4.	0.3 5.	0.1 6.	0.0 7.	0.2 8.	15.7 9.
16.	Other Student Services	22.8 1.	3.4 2.	1.1 3.	0.4 4.	0.3 5.	0.1 6.	0.1 7.	0.1 8.	46.2 9.
17.	Off-Campus Service	13.7 1.	1.3 2.	0.4 3.	0.1 4.	0.1 5.	0.0 6.	0.0 7.	0.1 8.	58.5 9.
18.	Committee & Administrative	34.4 1.	5.5 2.	2.2 3.	1.0 4.	0.5 5.	0.3 6.	0.1 7.	0.2 8.	30.1 9.
19.	Other ______________	8.4 1.	2.9 2.	1.8 3.	0.9 4.	0.5 5.	0.2 6.	0.1 7.	0.2 8.	59.1 9.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

ONLY FULL-TIME PERSONNEL WHO ARE NOT PRIMARILY TEACHING FACULTY ARE TO ANSWER QUESTION 20. PART-TIME PERSONNEL GO DIRECTLY TO QUESTION 31. FULL-TIME PERSONNEL WHO ARE PRIMARILY TEACHING FACULTY GO DIRECTLY TO QUESTION 22.

20. What is your annual income from junior college work? (Nearest figure)

0.3	1.	$4,000 or less
0.1	2.	$5,000
0.1	3.	$6,000
0.3	4.	$7,000
1.0	5.	$8,000
2.0	6.	$9,000
2.3	7.	$10,000
2.3	8.	$11,000
3.7	9.	$12,000

2.7	11.	$13,000
2.1	12.	$14,000
1.5	13.	$15,000
1.1	14.	$16,000
1.3	15.	$17,000
0.5	16.	$18,000
0.2	17.	$19,000
0.8	18.	$20,000 or more

Question 21 has been omitted for machine processing purposes.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

ALL FULL-TIME PERSONNEL, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF DUTY, ARE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS 22 THROUGH 30. PART-TIME PERSONNEL GO DIRECTLY TO QUESTION 31.

22. Do you own or rent your present residence?

69.9	1.	Own or buying
26.5	2.	Rent
1.3	3.	Other

23. Have you taught in industry, for the Federal government, or while in the Armed Forces? (If so, how many years?)

5.8	1.	1
6.1	2.	2
4.4	3.	3
3.3	4.	4
2.0	5.	5
1.1	6.	6
0.8	7.	7
5.3	8.	8 or more
67.9	9.	Have not taught for these agencies

24. What was the principal method by which you obtained your present position?

16.2	1.	Sought out by President or Dean
9.7	2.	Recommended by fellow teacher
3.5	3.	Recommended by graduate professor
4.4	4.	Placement procedure of graduate school
25.4	5.	Your initiative by letter
25.5	6.	Your initiative by personal visit to school
7.5	7.	You were in some other school in the same junior college area
1.4	8.	Commercial placement agency
5.0	9.	Other ______________________________

25. Since obtaining your present position, have you attempted to locate another position, and if so, why?

80.8	1.	Have not sought another position
4.9	2.	Higher pay
2.2	3.	More desirable school
1.9	4.	More desirable community
2.0	5.	Different level of education (secondary, college, etc.)
1.1	6.	Different type of duty but in a junior college
0.3	7.	Desire to leave education
3.0	8.	Other ______________________________

If you have taught in primary or secondary schools, what were the two principal reasons that influenced your change to the junior college?

(On this and similar double questions, please answer both of the questions.)

26. First Reason			27. Second Reason	
11.2	1.	Higher yearly pay	10.0	1.
1.9	2.	More prestige	3.8	2.
2.8	3.	Better hours	5.0	3.
15.6	4.	Prefer older students	10.7	4.
12.3	5.	More independence in work	13.6	5.
9.4	6.	Advance subject content	9.5	6.
5.9	7.	Other ________________	4.3	7.
36.3	8.	Have not taught in primary or secondary schools	34.2	8.

If you have taught in a four-year college or university, what were the two principal reasons that influenced your change to the junior college?

28. First Reason			29. Second Reason	
5.2	1.	Higher yearly pay	2.6	1.
0.5	2.	More personal prestige	1.0	2.
0.6	3.	Better hours	1.1	3.
0.5	4.	Prefer younger students	0.6	4.
2.2	5.	Prefer general education	2.4	5.
3.5	6.	Less emphasis on research	4.3	6.
12.8	7.	Other ________________	8.7	7.
69.1	8.	Have not taught in 4-year college	63.7	8.

30. During the summer sessions, how do you spend your time?

24.2	1.	Teaching at your school
0.7	2.	Teaching at another school
1.3	3.	Working in industry
7.1	4.	Rest and relax
7.9	5.	Attend graduate school
7.8	6.	Travel
25.5	7.	Am on 12-month salary basis
7.4	8.	Other ________________________________
15.6	9.	Combination of two or more of above responses.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

ONLY PART-TIME PERSONNEL ARE TO ANSWER QUESTION 31. ALL FULL-TIME PERSONNEL GO DIRECTLY TO QUESTION 32.

31. What is your income from teaching in the junior college? (Nearest figure)

0.0	1.	$500
0.0	2.	$1,000
0.0	3.	$1,500
0.0	4.	$2,000
0.0	5.	$2,500
0.0	6.	$3,000
0.0	7.	$3,500
0.0	8.	$4,000
0.0	9.	$4,500

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

EVERYONE PLEASE ANSWER THE REMAINING QUESTIONS. PLEASE ANSWER ALL PARTS OF THE QUESTION ON THIS AND ALL SIMILAR DOUBLE AND TRIPLE QUESTIONS.

Where did your parents live most of their lives?

32. Father			33. Mother	
17.0	1.	Florida	17.3	1.
19.4	2.	Southeast	19.2	2.
8.4	3.	Mid-Atlantic	8.5	3.
19.3	4.	Northeast	18.9	4.
7.2	5.	South Central	7.2	5.
19.9	6.	North Central	19.6	6.
3.1	7.	Southwest	2.8	7.
1.2	8.	Northwest	1.1	8.
3.0	9.	Foreign country	2.8	9.

34. What was or is your father's major lifetime occupation?

4.6	1.	Work in primary, secondary, or college-level education
14.8	2.	Professional (other than education) or scientific
26.8	3.	Business owner or executive
10.0	4.	Farm owner or renter
7.2	5.	Clerk or salesman
20.3	6.	Skilled worker or foreman
5.5	7.	Semi-skilled worker
2.4	8.	Unskilled worker or farm laborer
7.6	9.	Other________________________________

35. If your mother worked regularly, was it:

21.7 1. Full time
9.1 2. Part time
64.3 3. Did not work regularly

What grade level did your parents complete?

36. Father			37. Mother	
29.8	1.	8th grade or less	23.6	1.
15.2	2.	High school--non-graduate	15.2	2.
19.7	3.	High school--graduated	28.8	3.
6.1	4.	College--1 year only	8.0	4.
8.4	5.	College--non-graduate	9.5	5.
9.2	6.	Bachelor's Degree	9.5	6.
3.0	7.	Master's Degree	2.2	7.
5.5	8.	Medical, Law, Divinity, etc.	0.8	8.
1.8	9.	PhD, EdD, or other educational doctorate	0.2	9.

Where did you live during the major part of your youth and adulthood?

38. Youth (before college)			39. Adulthood (after college)	
22.4	1.	Florida	43.9	1.
18.3	2.	Southeast	17.1	2.
8.4	3.	Mid-Atlantic	5.3	3.
17.9	4.	Northeast	8.9	4.
6.9	5.	South Central	4.3	5.
18.4	6.	North Central	8.9	6.
3.1	7.	Southwest	3.2	7.
1.0	8.	Northwest	0.7	8.
2.4	9.	Foreign country	2.1	9.

What was the population of the community in which you spent the major part of your:

40. Youth (before college)			41. Adulthood (after college)	
11.1	1.	Farm	1.1	1.
16.0	2.	2,500 or less	5.4	2.
23.6	3.	10,000	18.1	3.
16.7	4.	50,000	24.8	4.
11.4	5.	100,000	18.6	5.
9.2	6.	500,000	13.3	6.
10.7	7.	1,000,000 or more	14.1	7.

42. What type of high school did you attend?

8.8 1. Small-rural
3.6 2. Large-rural
24.0 3. Small school in a town
19.2 4. Large school in a town
9.8 5. Small school in a city
33.2 6. Large school in a city

43. Did you ever attend a junior college?

18.6 1. Yes
79.0 2. No

From what type of college did you receive your degrees?

44. Bachelors		45. Masters		46. Earned doctorate		
22.2	1.	5.9	1.	1.2	1.	Small private college
6.4	2.	1.9	2.	0.3	2.	Small teachers college
4.4	3.	4.0	3.	0.2	3.	Large teachers college
6.0	4.	3.0	4.	0.3	4.	Small public college
9.8	5.	6.8	5.	0.5	5.	Large public college
5.7	6.	5.5	6.	0.4	6.	Large private college
32.5	7.	47.3	7.	6.1	7.	Large public university
9.2	8.	13.4	8.	2.3	8.	Large private university
2.7	9.	11.2	9.	88.1	9.	No degree

Where did you obtain your degrees?

47. Bachelors		45. Masters		49. Earned doctorate		
29.1	1.	31.2	1.	3.9	1.	Florida
18.2	2.	15.5	2.	1.5	2.	Southeast
7.9	3.	6.3	3.	0.7	3.	Mid-Atlantic
12.0	4.	10.1	4.	1.2	4.	Northeast
7.0	5.	5.8	5.	0.6	5.	South Central
16.2	6.	13.3	6.	1.6	6.	North Central
3.6	7.	3.5	7.	1.0	7.	Southwest
1.2	8.	1.5	8.	0.1	8.	Northwest
3.1	9.	11.4	9.	88.2	9.	No degree

50. What grade level has your spouse completed?

20.1 1. I have no spouse
0.7 2. 8th grade or less
2.6 3. High school--non-graduate
13.3 4. High school--graduated

22.5 5. College--non-graduate
22.6 6. Bachelor's Degree
12.0 7. Master's Degree
2.8 8. Medical, Law, Divinity, etc.
2.3 9. PhD or EdD or other educational doctorate

51. Approximately what was your grade average as an undergraduate?

4.8 1. A
12.3 2. A-
22.7 3. B+
22.9 4. B
18.8 5. B-
13.3 6. C+
3.9 7. C
0.4 8. C-
0.2 9. Below C-

52. Did you belong to a college social fraternity or sorority?

34.5 1. Yes
64.1 2. No

53. To how many civic groups do you belong? (Rotary, Lions, Kiwanis, Jaycees, etc.)

23.4 1. 1
12.5 2. 2
4.8 3. 3
1.9 4. 4
1.8 5. 5 or more
55.1 6. None

54. How often do you participate in the religious and social activities of your church?

39.4 1. Regularly
13.3 2. Often
16.3 3. Not very often
15.7 4. Seldom
14.5 5. Never

55. Do you belong to professional or scholarly organizations related to your subject matter areas? (If so, how many?)

22.0 1. 1
28.4 2. 2

19.8 3. 3
9.8 4. 4
10.4 5. 5 or more
9.4 6. None

56. Do you belong to national, regional, or state education organizations of a general nature? (e.g., NEA, FEA, AAUP, FAPJC, American Federation of Teachers (AFT), National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges (NFA), etc.) (If so, how many?)

30.2 1. 1
22.8 2. 2
16.1 3. 3
7.0 4. 4
4.7 5. 5 or more
18.7 6. None

57. If you belong to NEA, FEA, AFT, AAUP, NFA, or similar organizations, how much influence do you consider they are able to exercise in achieving your goals and objectives at the state and/or national level?

8.1 1. Extensive
32.5 2. Moderate
25.4 3. Slight
8.5 4. Practically non-existent
22.8 5. Do not belong to such organizations

Did you obtain your degree primarily by attending school full time or on a part-time basis?

58. Bachelors		59. Masters		60. Earned doctorate		
88.2	1.	56.2	1.	7.8	1.	Full time
8.3	2.	32.1	2.	3.3	2.	Part time
2.9	3.	11.3	3.	88.3	3.	No degree

61. How many semester course hours do you have toward a Master's Degree?

85.4 1. I have a Master's Degree completed
7.2 2. I am not working toward a Master's Degree
2.8 3. 10 hours
1.4 4. 20 hours
1.3 5. 30 hours
1.0 6. 40 hours or more

62. How many semester course hours do you have __beyond__ your Master's Degree which are __not__ a part of a __formal__ doctoral program?

9.0	1.	I do not have a Master's Degree
26.0	2.	None
8.2	3.	I have an earned doctorate
24.4	4.	10 or less
14.0	5.	20
8.3	6.	30
3.9	7.	40
4.6	8.	50 or more

63. How many semester hours do you have toward a Doctor's Degree--__beyond__ your Master's Degree in a __formal__ doctoral program?

10.2	1.	I do not have a Master's Degree
60.7	2.	I have a Master's Degree but am not working toward a doctorate
9.1	3.	I have a Doctor's Degree completed
6.2	4.	10 or less
3.4	5.	20
2.3	6.	30
2.9	7.	40 or more
3.9	8.	All but dissertation

In what areas of study were your degrees earned? (Please check only one item at each degree level, except in cases where you have more than one degree at any level.)

64. __Bachelors__		65. __Masters__		66. __Doctorate__		
1.7	1.	.7	1.	.03	1.	Agriculture
6.8	2.	5.0	2.	.75	2.	Biological Sciences
9.7	3.	5.6	3.	.22	3.	Business & Commerce
1.6	4.	.8	4.	0.0	4.	Primary Education
3.2	5.	1.1	5.	.03	5.	Nursing
.8	6.	8.8	6.	1.93	6.	Educational Administration
5.0	7.	1.7	7.	.03	7.	Engineering
13.0	8.	8.1	8.	.45	8.	English
2.2	9.	4.7	9.	.49	9.	Fine Arts
2.7	11.	2.3	11.	.18	11.	Foreign Language
.3	12.	1.2	12.	.37	12.	Curriculum & Instruction
1.0	13.	.5	13.	.03	13.	Home Economics
2.2	14.	1.3	14.	.07	14.	Industrial & Voc. Arts
1.1	15.	.6	15.	.03	15.	Journalism
.4	16.	2.9	16.	.03	16.	Library Science

5.8	17.	5.1	17.	0.0	17.	Mathematics
1.1	18.	.8	18.	.15	18.	Philosophy
6.3	19.	4.9	19.	.15	19.	Physical & Health Education
5.4	21.	3.6	21.	.22	21.	Physical Sciences
2.9	22.	2.3	22.	.53	22.	Psychology
.6	23.	.9	23.	.15	23.	Religion
11.8	24.	8.2	24.	.49	24.	Social Sciences
.3	25.	5.8	25.	.41	25.	Guidance
1.4	26.	1.7	26.	.15	26.	Speech
6.0	27.	6.4	27.	.03	27.	Secondary Education
6.5	28.	8.0	28.	2.19	28.	Other ____________________
2.4	29.	10.0	29.	90.76	29.	No degree

Questions 67, 68, 69, and 70 have been omitted for machine processing purposes.

71. Are you now working in a subject area for which you prepared as an undergraduate or graduate student?

71.5	1. Yes--full time
16.2	2. Yes--predominantly
5.4	3. Mostly in other subject areas
4.2	4. Entirely in other subject areas

72. In how many 4-year colleges and universities have you taught?

20.2	1. 1
8.2	2. 2
2.8	3. 3
1.4	4. 4
1.2	5. 5 or more
65.1	6. None

73. How many years did you teach in 4-year college or university?

10.5	1. 1
9.7	2. 3
4.2	3. 5
2.5	4. 7
2.0	5. 9
1.5	6. 11
2.8	7. 13 or more
65.7	8. None

74. In how many junior colleges have you taught (including present one)?

80.1 1. 1
13.8 2. 2
2.5 3. 3
0.5 4. 4
1.0 5. 5 or more

75. How many years have you taught in junior colleges?

13.1 1. 1
16.2 2. 2
16.4 3. 3
8.8 4. 4
7.5 5. 5
4.9 6. 6
4.8 7. 7
15.6 8. 8 or more
11.3 9. Less than one year

76. How many years have you taught or worked in the junior college where you are now employed?

15.2 1. 1
18.1 2. 2
17.5 3. 3
8.4 4. 4
6.2 5. 5
4.2 6. 6
4.4 7. 7
12.1 8. 8 or more
13.3 9. Less than one year

77. In what other region have you taught in a junior college for the longest period?

0.9 1. Mid-Atlantic
1.4 2. Northeast
1.3 3. South Central
1.2 4. North Central
1.1 5. Southwest
0.3 6. Northwest
2.9 7. Southeast--other than Florida
88.9 8. No other region

78. In how many elementary and secondary schools have you taught?

20.2 1. 1
16.1 2. 2
10.5 3. 3
6.1 4. 4
3.6 5. 5
1.3 6. 6
3.0 7. 7 or more
38.9 8. None

79. How many years did you teach in elementary and secondary schools?

8.9 1. 1
12.2 2. 3
8.8 3. 5
7.4 4. 7
6.2 5. 9
5.1 6. 11
12.2 7. 13 or more
38.7 8. None

80. In which area is most of the work in your present job done?

63.8 1. Academic
14.1 2. Technical and special degree
0.8 3. Cultural non-credit
2.7 4. Vocational non-credit
13.0 5. Administration
4.9 6. Counseling

81. Is your family satisfied with the community in which you live?

49.9 1. Very satisfied
36.2 2. Satisfied
5.3 3. Indifferent
5.4 4. Unsatisfied
1.6 5. Very dissatisfied

82. If salary, promotion, and security were equal in each of the following types of institutions, in which would you prefer to teach?

1.1 1. High school
54.2 2. Junior college
34.8 3. 4-year college or university
9.4 4. No strong preference

83. If you had your life to live again, would you:

1.0 1. teach in a primary school
1.2 2. teach in a secondary school
49.7 3. teach in a junior college
29.6 4. teach in a university
14.8 5. choose a career outside education

84. Do you expect to continue in the junior college field until you retire from full-time employment?

58.5 1. Yes
11.6 2. No
29.6 3. Don't know

85. What is your over-all attitude toward junior college work as a career?

50.1 1. Very satisfied
43.5 2. Satisfied
3.1 3. Indifferent
2.6 4. Dissatisfied
0.5 5. Very dissatisfied

86. Do you favor the principle of merit pay for faculty members?

20.1 1. Strongly favor
31.3 2. Favor
21.7 3. Neither for nor against
20.6 4. Strongly against
5.6 5. Not familiar with principle.

87. What is your attitude toward faculty rank (e.g., instructor, assistant professor, etc.) for all faculty members of the Florida junior colleges?

18.7 1. Strongly favor it
30.8 2. Favor it
25.3 3. Neither for nor against it
13.4 4. Against it
8.1 5. Strongly against it
3.3 6. Not familiar with it

88. Which nomenclature do you prefer as a part of the name for your institution?

48.9 1. Junior College
19.6 2. Community Junior College
20.8 3. Community College
8.4 4. College
1.8 5. Other ________________________________

89. Who would you say has the most powerful voice in determining the educational program for your college?

5.3 1. State Board of Education and the Legislature
2.6 2. State Department of Education
6.9 3. Junior College District Board of Trustees
34.2 4. President of junior college
10.5 5. Deans
11.5 6. Department and division heads
4.7 7. Faculty
1.0 8. Students
21.1 9. Power is spread too wide to attribute to a single source

90. How many formal courses have you taken which were specifically designed to prepare you for teaching in a junior college in contrast to teaching at some other level of education?

15.1 1. 1
10.9 2. 2
6.6 3. 3
12.3 4. 4 or more
54.2 5. None

91. How many informal or non-credit courses have you taken which were specifically designed to assist you in teaching in a junior college in contrast to teaching at some other level of education?

8.9 1. 1
4.7 2. 2
2.0 3. 3
3.9 4. 4 or more
79.2 5. None

92. Have you had specific course(s) dealing primarily with junior college curriculum and purpose? (If so, how many?)

22.7 1. 1
9.7 2. 2
2.4 3. 3
4.1 4. 4 or more
60.2 5. None

93. Have you participated in an in-service program where considerable attention was directed to junior college curriculum and purposes? (If so, in how many such programs have you been a participant?)

21.3 1. 1
8.6 2. 2
2.5 3. 3
4.3 4. 4 or more
62.3 5. None

94. For the most part, were your teaching methods courses designed for teaching in:

2.7 1. a primary school
53.6 2. a secondary school
11.9 3. a junior college
8.3 4. a 4-year college
3.0 5. industry, armed forces, or government agency
18.1 6. I have had no such courses

95. How many hours a week on the average do you devote to your work for the junior college?

0.5 1. 10 hours or less
1.2 2. 20 hours
2.1 3. 30 hours
8.1 4. 35 hours
22.8 5. 40 hours
18.3 6. 45 hours
11.3 7. 48 hours
17.1 8. 50 hours
17.8 9. 55 hours or more

Indicate your two main reasons for satisfaction with the nature of junior college work.

96. First reason			97. Second reason	
15.1	1.	Association with college age students	17.2	1.
27.6	2.	Helping young people grow	19.9	2.
1.7	3.	Public image of junior college	3.0	3.
12.2	4.	Transmitting knowledge	14.6	4.
35.6	5.	Enjoyment of teaching	22.3	5.
0.7	6.	Freedom from research	4.1	6.
2.5	7.	Offering "second chance" to college students	10.4	7.
3.4	8.	Other ______________________	4.1	8.
0.8	9.	None	3.6	9.

Indicate your two main reasons for dissatisfaction with the nature of junior college work.

98. First reason			99. Second reason	
0.2	1.	Association with college age students	0.3	1.
0.4	2.	Necessity of helping young people grow	0.5	2.
14.0	3.	Need to transmit elementary knowledge	5.8	3.
8.4	4.	Public image of junior college	7.0	4.
13.0	5.	Lack of time for research	8.5	5.

1.8	6.	"Second chance" for students	2.7	6.
3.8	7.	Multi-purpose school	5.0	7.
13.9	8.	Other ________	7.3	8.
42.6	9.	None	58.5	9.

What are your two main satisfactions with the working conditions in a junior college?

100. First Choice			101. Second Choice	
6.2	1.	Well-motivated students	5.3	1.
18.5	2.	Fine colleagues	17.5	2.
11.7	3.	Intellectually stimulating associations	14.2	3.
18.0	4.	Desirable environment	17.4	4.
37.8	5.	Freedom and independence in work	22.2	5.
2.9	6.	Desirable physical facilities	13.9	6.
1.6	7.	Other ________	2.1	7.
2.2	8.	None	6.1	8.

What are your two main dissatisfactions with working conditions in a junior college?

102. First Choice			103. Second Choice	
25.3	1.	Poorly motivated students	9.8	1.
1.7	2.	Colleagues	2.5	2.
3.8	3.	Environment	3.3	3.
10.9	4.	Excessive classroom hours	7.9	4.
6.0	5.	Restrictions in work	6.0	5.
8.2	6.	Lack of time for class preparation	9.3	6.
12.8	7.	Other ________	8.7	7.
29.7	8.	None	48.8	8.

What are your two main satisfactions with the appreciations and rewards of junior college teaching?

104. First Choice			105. Second Choice	
13.3	1.	Pay	15.9	1.
4.6	2.	Security (tenure, retirement, etc.)	8.1	2.
2.4	3.	Prestige and recognition	6.4	3.
30.9	4.	Sense of social usefulness	23.3	4.
42.5	5.	Personal satisfaction	29.2	5.
3.2	6.	Being in Florida	9.0	6.
1.1	7.	Other ________	1.6	7.
1.1	8.	None	4.6	8.

What are your two main dissatisfactions with junior college work?

106. First Choice			107. Second Choice	
10.2	1.	Pay	6.7	1.
25.0	2.	Administrative procedures	10.7	2.
8.4	3.	Working Hours	8.1	3.
8.4	4.	Student Load	7.4	4.
1.8	5.	Counseling responsibilities	2.2	5.
4.4	6.	Extra-curricular duties	4.9	6.
5.8	7.	"Low status" of junior colleges	6.8	7.
5.3	8.	Other ______________________	5.1	8.
29.0	9.	None	44.6	9.

108. What is your general attitude towards teaching as a career?

57.9	1.	Very satisfied
37.1	2.	Satisfied
2.2	3.	Indifferent
1.0	4.	Dissatisfied
0.5	5.	Very dissatisfied

Which two of the factors listed below would you consider as having the most overall benefit to junior college work?

109. First Choice			110. Second Choice	
31.0	1.	Higher pay	16.6	1.
9.4	2.	More prestige for teachers	10.5	2.
12.5	3.	Better facilities (buildings, etc.)	12.2	3.
7.9	4.	More restrictive admissions policies	6.3	4.
17.9	5.	Lighter teaching load	16.1	5.
4.2	6.	Paid time for research	7.1	6.
5.4	7.	More clerical help	13.4	7.
3.5	8.	Better security (tenure, retirement, etc.)	7.0	8.
5.3	9.	Other ______________________	4.8	9.

111. Does the relatively small size of the junior college, as compared to the university, appeal to you as a place to teach?

55.5	1.	Yes
7.8	2.	No
34.5	3.	Not important

After the first week of school, what percentage of time should and does the classroom teacher devote to academic advising concerned with course work?

112. Should

38.8 1. 10%
29.3 2. 20%
11.7 3. 30%
3.3 4. 40%
3.0 5. 50%
5.6 6. None

113. Does

53.4 1. 10%
16.9 2. 20%
5.8 3. 30%
1.9 4. 40%
1.7 5. 50%
9.5 6. None

After the first week of school, what percentage of time should and does the classroom teacher devote to personal counseling, other than academic course work?

114. Should

50.4 1. 10%
13.6 2. 20%
4.5 3. 30%
1.0 4. 40%
0.9 5. 50%
20.4 6. None

115. Does

55.4 1. 10%
8.6 2. 20%
3.9 3. 30%
0.9 4. 40%
0.6 5. 50%
19.7 6. None

116. In your opinion, should a junior college rely primarily on professionally trained counselors for:

34.0 1. personal problems other than class work
9.2 2. academic advising (course selection, academic progress, etc.)
46.7 3. both academic and personal problems
7.8 4. both types of problems are better handled by classroom teachers

117. In your opinion, should the orientation of new students be primarily concentrated in:

13.0 1. the late high school period
30.3 2. before enrollment (summer, etc.)
22.6 3. during the first week of school
23.9 4. throughout the first semester
8.8 5. orientation is not effective enough to matter when it is done

118. It is sometimes said that "junior colleges devote too much time and effort to counseling on personal or life adjustment problems." To what extent do you agree or disagree with such a statement?

4.0 1. Strongly agree
11.4 2. Agree

25.9 3. Have no opinion
41.5 4. Disagree
16.6 5. Strongly disagree

119. It is sometimes said that "in junior colleges which accept most all applicants there is no reason for extensive testing of new students." To what extent do you agree or disagree with such a statement?

2.9 1. Strongly agree
8.3 2. Agree
5.8 3. Have no opinion
46.0 4. Disagree
36.4 5. Strongly disagree

120. Some junior college officials take the position that faculty members should expect to participate as advisors, chaperones, etc., in student extracurricular activities. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this position?

7.2 1. Strongly agree
41.8 2. Agree
8.5 3. Have no opinion
27.0 4. Disagree
14.7 5. Strongly disagree

121. Do you desire to participate as an advisor, chaperone, etc., in student extracurricular activities?

9.7 1. Very much
46.1 2. Some
26.1 3. Very little
17.4 4. Not at all

In your opinion, should the junior college actively stimulate student participation in student clubs (government, honoraries, newspaper, language clubs, etc.) and student recreations (dances, social organizations, parties, etc.)?

122. Clubs			123. Recreation	
31.9	1.	Extensively	25.8	1.
40.7	2.	When convenient	40.3	2.
23.9	3.	Limited amount	23.7	3.
2.4	4.	Not at all	3.6	4.

124. How many students are you presently advising on academic problems?

26.9 1. None
19.2 2. Less than 10
13.2 3. 10 to 15
8.1 4. 16 to 20
8.3 5. 21 to 30
22.5 6. Over 30

125. How many students are you currently counseling on problems other than academic problems?

42.2 1. None
32.7 2. Less than 10
9.8 3. 10 to 15
3.4 4. 16 to 20
2.2 5. 21 to 30
8.0 6. Over 30

126. In your opinion, is counseling of all types more important, equally important or less important than academic instruction?

4.2 1. More important
57.9 2. Equally important
32.8 3. Less important
4.1 4. No opinion

127. Is academic advising on course selection and progress in course work more important, equally important, or less important than academic instruction?

4.6 1. More important
60.8 2. Equally important
30.4 3. Less important
3.0 4. No opinion

128. Is counseling on personal problems more important, equally important, or less important than academic instruction?

5.5 1. More important
48.7 2. Equally important
40.0 3. Less important
4.5 4. No opinion

129. Is counseling on personal problems any more important in a junior college than in a 4-year college?

30.6 1. More important
54.6 2. Equally important

3.6 3. Less Important
9.8 4. No opinion

130. In our junior colleges, where should the emphasis be placed?

8.0 1. Primarily transfer function
2.0 2. Primarily terminal function
2.5 3. Primarily community service
21.2 4. About equally on transfer and terminal function
3.9 5. About equally on transfer and community service
0.6 6. About equally on terminal and community service
60.5 7. About equally on transfer, terminal, and community service

(131. to 161.) Indicate the degree of importance that should be attached to the following functions which might be performed by a junior college in Florida.

1. Very important function of a junior college
2. Important function of a junior college
3. Of little importance as a junior college function
4. Should not be a function of a junior college

		1	2	3	4
131.	Guided or developmental studies in English (written)	60.5	31.1	3.3	3.9
132.	Guided or developmental studies in mathematics	51.6	38.2	5.0	3.6
133.	Guided or developmental studies in study skills	54.0	35.0	5.7	3.9
134.	Guided or developmental studies in reading	61.3	29.7	3.7	3.9
135.	Transfer (college parallel) program	63.6	31.9	2.1	1.2
136.	Terminal program	54.3	38.7	3.8	1.8
137.	Adult non-credit courses	28.9	50.7	14.7	4.6
138.	Evening courses of all types	47.3	44.0	5.5	2.2
139.	High school completion courses	10.2	19.4	22.0	47.3
140.	Adult vocational courses	22.8	39.7	19.5	16.9

141.	Elderly citizens courses	11.9	37.8	32.6	16.6
142.	General education courses	46.5	40.9	8.3	3.1
143.	Public forums	14.8	45.6	27.9	10.3
144.	Concerts, plays, etc.	24.6	52.4	18.3	3.7
145.	Adult personal enrichment courses, e.g., art, music, literature	24.2	51.9	19.0	4.0
146.	Counseling on personal problems	25.6	48.8	17.9	6.8
147.	Career selection counseling	40.3	49.5	7.4	1.9
148.	Student government	21.5	53.5	20.3	3.7
149.	Student interest clubs and honorary societies	15.3	57.9	23.1	2.8
150.	Student recreation	15.6	53.2	26.5	3.5
151.	Personal relationships between faculty and student	41.7	44.6	10.0	2.6
152.	Athletics (intercollegiate and/or intermural)	16.5	50.8	25.3	6.2
153.	Provide financial assistance to students	33.6	54.3	9.2	2.1
154.	Preparation for marriage and family life	20.2	49.5	22.6	6.9
155.	Developing good health habits	19.5	48.4	23.9	7.2
156.	Developing social competence	22.6	52.4	18.6	5.3
157.	Developing civic responsibility	33.5	52.3	10.9	2.4
158.	Data gathering on students and its use by faculty	16.9	52.5	22.8	6.4
159.	Short courses for business and industry	24.0	55.2	16.2	3.6
160.	Open admission policy to all courses	20.3	31.5	16.6	30.0
161.	Restricted admission policy to college transfer courses	25.6	36.4	16.5	19.1

(162. to 166.) Considered in relation to the over-all educational standards achieved by your school, compare the following factors to 4-year colleges and universities.

162. Qualifications of faculty in your junior college for the work they do:

57.3 1. very good
31.7 2. good
9.3 3. average
1.0 4. poor
0.2 5. very poor

163. Quality of your students in their academic classes:

6.3 1. very good
27.0 2. good
52.1 3. average
12.6 4. poor
0.9 5. very poor

164. Quality of teaching in your junior college:

44.0 1. very good
42.8 2. good
11.8 3. average
0.5 4. poor
0.1 5. very poor

165. Quality of administration in your junior college:

33.1 1. very good
35.5 2. good
20.9 3. average
6.9 4. poor
3.0 5. very poor

166. Quality of student government in your junior college:

8.0 1. very good
26.8 2. good
45.7 3. average
15.2 4. poor
3.0 5. very poor

(167. to 171.) Considered in relation to the over-all educational standards achieved by your junior college, compare the following factors to your concept of a good public junior college.

167. Qualifications of the faculty of your junior college for the work they do:

57.3	1.	very good
34.1	2.	good
7.6	3.	average
0.8	4.	poor
0.1	5.	very poor

168. Quality of your students:

11.1	1.	very good
33.2	2.	good
49.5	3.	average
5.9	4.	poor
0.4	5.	very poor

169. Quality of teaching in your junior college:

46.5	1.	very good
41.4	2.	good
11.5	3.	average
0.7	4.	poor
0.0	5.	very poor

170. Quality of administration in your junior college:

35.3	1.	very good
34.8	2.	good
19.8	3.	average
7.2	4.	poor
3.0	5.	very poor

171. Quality of student government in your junior college:

9.4	1.	very good
27.7	2.	good
45.9	3.	average
13.9	4.	poor
3.1	5.	very poor

172. The flow of significant information, views, and opinions between the administration and the faculty in your school is:

17.5	1.	entirely adequate

52.8 2. fairly adequate
22.3 3. inadequate
7.5 4. completely inadequate

173. The flow of significant information, views, and opinions between faculty members in different areas of your school is:

9.7 1. entirely adequate
48.5 2. fairly adequate
35.6 3. inadequate
6.3 4. completely inadequate

174. Faculty influence and participation in your school in the selection of new faculty members is:

0.5 1. far too much
1.3 2. too much
59.5 3. about right
23.3 4. too little
15.5 5. far too little

175. Faculty influence and participation in assignments of class schedules is:

0.3 1. far too much
1.5 2. too much
66.5 3. about right
21.3 4. too little
10.5 5. far too little

176. Faculty influence and participation in student disciplinary matters is:

0.3 1. far too much
1.6 2. too much
75.0 3. about right
17.9 4. too little
5.2 5. far too little

177. Faculty participation and influence in the design of new buildings is:

0.5 1. far too much
0.8 2. too much
49.5 3. about right
30.1 4. too little
19.2 5. far too little

178. How is the morale of the faculty among your immediate co-workers?

33.4 1. Very good
35.3 2. Good
20.6 3. Average
7.8 4. Poor
3.0 5. Very poor

179. How is the morale of the faculty throughout your school?

20.3 1. Very good
39.1 2. Good
29.9 3. Average
8.6 4. Poor
2.0 5. Very poor

(180. to 225.) Indicate the degree of your satisfaction with the activities, programs, and features of your school listed below.

1. Entirely satisfied
2. Reasonably satisfied
3. Mixed feelings
4. Somewhat dissatisfied
5. Completely dissatisfied

		1	2	3	4	5
180.	Admission Policy	30.4	39.8	18.4	8.9	2.4
181.	Pre-admission counseling	11.5	41.1	26.0	16.8	4.7
182.	Registration procedures	14.1	35.8	22.0	17.8	10.3
183.	Classroom facilities	22.6	44.5	14.5	13.9	4.5
184.	Parking facilities	29.3	35.3	10.5	16.0	8.9
185.	Eating facilities	17.0	24.7	15.9	19.1	23.4
186.	Physical education facilities	23.2	39.8	15.8	12.2	9.0
187.	General Education program	23.0	57.8	15.1	3.2	0.9
188.	Student counseling services	15.8	43.7	25.8	11.2	3.6
189.	Purchasing policies	10.2	36.6	28.0	15.3	10.0
190.	Services offered in guided or developmental studies	18.7	46.5	26.4	6.6	1.9

191.	Quality of students attracted to your school	10.2	46.8	29.2	12.1	1.7
192.	Number of students in classrooms	15.5	44.6	17.2	16.7	6.0
193.	Student-teacher ratio	16.0	44.2	17.3	15.8	6.7
194.	Length of class period	35.8	49.9	9.1	3.8	1.4
195.	Faculty office facilities	24.0	36.4	12.8	17.2	9.6
196.	Library materials (books and periodicals)	30.5	48.3	10.9	7.8	2.4
197.	Audio-visual materials	28.0	47.8	15.1	7.1	2.1
198.	Expendable supplies	22.8	50.3	15.5	7.9	3.5
199.	Number and size of student scholarships	9.9	47.6	27.6	11.9	3.0
200.	Number and nature of personnel policies	9.5	45.0	29.0	12.8	3.8
201.	Clerical assistance	14.5	39.8	20.1	18.0	7.6
202.	Procedures for obtaining new library materials	26.9	51.4	14.4	5.2	2.1
203.	Effectiveness in obtaining new library materials	25.3	49.7	16.3	6.6	2.2
204.	School catalog	21.9	52.1	15.9	7.1	3.0
205.	Library reading area	32.7	44.6	11.9	7.5	3.3
206.	Student lounge or center	20.8	32.8	17.4	15.9	13.1
207.	Auditorium facilities	20.3	28.1	13.7	17.3	20.6
208.	Reserve book procedures in library	33.2	49.3	12.8	3.2	1.5
209.	Library hours	39.3	45.0	9.5	4.7	1.4
210.	Responsiveness of librarians to faculty and student needs	52.7	36.4	7.2	2.5	1.2
211.	Student social program in general	9.7	43.7	36.4	7.8	2.5

212.	Regulations on student dress	16.2	37.6	24.5	12.7	9.0
213.	School newspaper	14.4	42.8	24.0	12.5	6.4
214.	Present grading practices (A, B, C, D, etc.)	25.8	44.6	18.3	7.4	3.9
215.	Teaching load	19.4	41.7	18.9	14.5	5.6
216.	Student contact hours	18.0	46.8	19.4	11.3	4.6
217.	Provisions for professional and sabbatical leave	18.6	37.6	19.5	14.1	10.3
218.	Faculty participation in curriculum development	15.4	43.1	21.9	13.3	6.4
219.	Faculty in-service training programs	7.5	33.4	32.2	18.1	8.8
220.	College organization and administrative procedures	14.4	38.3	24.7	15.1	7.5
221.	Effectiveness of the faculty handbook	13.2	43.9	26.1	10.7	6.2
222.	Time available for professional study and preparation for classes	11.8	40.1	22.8	18.6	6.8
223.	Faculty participation in institutional policy-formulation and decision-making	9.4	32.5	26.8	18.4	12.8
224.	Effectiveness of faculty meetings	7.4	29.9	30.0	19.7	12.9
225.	Orientation procedures for new faculty members.	15.1	44.5	22.0	12.2	6.4

Please add below any comments or suggestions you have for improving our Florida junior college system.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

REFERENCES

1. American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968 Junior College Directory. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1968.

2. Atwell, Charles A. "Institutional and Community Characteristics Related to the Effectiveness of Transfer Programs in Florida Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Florida, 1968.

3. Burnette, Horace J. "An Analysis of the Internal Organizational Structures of Selected Public Junior Colleges in Florida." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Florida, 1966.

4. Campbell, Merton V. "Self-Role Conflict Among Teachers and Its Relationship to Satisfaction, Effectiveness, and Confidence in Leadership." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.

5. Colvert, C. C., and Baker, M. L. Salaries of Junior College Teachers and Administrators in the Junior Colleges of the United States for 1954-55. Austin, Texas: Research Office, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1954.

6. Colvert, C. C., and Litton, M. L. Junior College Teachers' Salaries. Austin, Texas: Research Office, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1953.

7. Crossland, Fred E. "Reflections from the Outside." Selected Papers from the 46th Annual Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges. February 28 - March 4, 1966 at St. Louis, Missouri. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1966.

8. Eckert, Ruth E., and Stecklein, John E. Job Motivations and Satisfactions of College Teachers. (U. S. Office of Education Research Monograph No. 7, 1961) Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961.

9. Garrison, Rogert H. Junior College Faculty - Issues and Problems. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

10. Getzels, Jacob W., Lipham, James M., and Campbell, Roland F. Educational Administration as a Social Process. New York: Harper and Roe, Publishers, 1968.

11. Gustad, John W. The Career Decisions of College Teachers. Southern Regional Education Board Monograph Series No. 2, Atlanta, Ga.: The Board, 1960.

12. Honer, Stanley M. "Faculty Power and Participation." Junior College Journal. 36:28-32 (No. 5, February 1966).

13. Hunt, W. Anthony. "Selection of Instructional Staff." Leadership Opportunities and the Beginning Junior College President. Report from the Southeastern Regional Junior College Leadership Program, 1965.

14. Johns, R. L. "Organizational Structure for Junior Colleges." Exploring the Tasks of the Community Junior College Administrator. Proceedings of the First Junior College Administrative Teams Institute. July 31 - August 5, 1961, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

15. Johnson, B. Lamar. Starting a Community Junior College. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964.

16. Kiernan, Irene R. "Overcoming Resistance to Faculty Evaluation." Selected Papers from the 46th Annual Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges. February 28 - March 4, 1966, at St. Louis, Missouri. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1966.

17. Kinsinger, Robert E. "Trends in Educating of Health Service Workers." Selected Papers from the 46th Annual Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges. February 28 - March 4, 1966, at St. Louis, Missouri. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1966.

18. Koos, Leonard V. The Junior College Movement. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1925.

19. ___________. "Junior College Teachers: Degrees and Graduate Residence." Junior College Journal. 18:77-89 (October 1947).

20. Lahti, Robert E. "A Faculty Role in Policy Formulation." Junior College Journal. 37:9-12 (No. 1, September 1966).

21. Lipscomb, William P., Jr. "An Analysis of Faculty Attitudes in Relation to the Stated Role of Mississippi Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1965.

22. Lombardi, John. "Faculty in the Administrative Process." Junior College Journal. 37:9-16 (No. 3, November 1966).

23. McDowell, F. M. The Junior College. U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin 1919, No. 35. Washington; U. S. Government Printing Office, 1919.

24. Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1960.

25. Merson, Thomas B. "The Junior College: Today's Goals, Tomorrow's Aspirations." Board/Administrator Relationships. Proceedings of Junior College Institutes, Biloxi, Miss., August 2-4, 1964 and Atlanta, Ga., August 5-7, 1964. Gainesville: University of Florida and Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1964.

26. Mills, E. R. "Public Junior College Faculty: Staffing Practices, Characteristics, and Opinions." Unpublished term paper for EDA 630, College of Education, University of Florida, May, 1968.

27. Montgomery, Douglas M. "An Analysis of Faculty Acceptance of and Commitment to the Stated Mission of the Florida Community Junior College." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1962.

28. Morphet, Edgar L., Johns, Roc L., and Reller, Theodore L. Educational Organization and Administration. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

29. Reynolds, James W. "Improvement of Instruction in the Junior College." Improvement of Instruction. Proceedings of the Fourth Junior College Administrative Teams Institute, July 27-31, 1964, at Pensacola, Florida.

30. Schroeder, Wayne L. "Significant Research in Junior College Adult Education." Excellence in Continuing Education. Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Junior College Administrative Teams Institute, August 7-9, 1966, at the University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

31. Siehr, Hugo E., Jamrich, John X., and Hereford, Karl T. Problems of New Faculty Members in Community Colleges. Published by Michigan State University in cooperation with American Association of Junior Colleges, 1963.

32. State Department of Education (Florida). Biennial Report. Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Florida. For the Fiscal Years Beginning July 1, 1957, and Ending June 30, 1958. Tallahassee: The Department, 1958.

33. __________. Five Years of Progress - Florida's Community Junior Colleges - Their Contribution and Their Future. (A Report to the State Department of Education by the State Junior College Advisory Board.) Tallahassee, Florida: The Department, 1963.

34. __________. Florida Public Junior Colleges, Instructional and Administrative Personnel, Fall 1967 (printed sheet). Tallahassee: Division of Community Junior Colleges, The Department, 1967.

35. Thornton, James W., Jr. The Community Junior College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

36. Wattenbarger, James L. "The Organization, Administration, and Financing of Public Junior Colleges in the State of Florida." Gainesville, Fla.: Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, College of Education, University of Florida, 1950.

37. Williams, Kenneth R. "Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures." Exploring the Tasks of the Community Junior College Administrator. Proceedings of the First Junior College Administrative Teams Institute, July 31 - August 5, 1961, at the University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.